

THE LOCAL UNION-MANAGEMENT RELATIONSHIP

- A CASE STUDY

by

Maxwell Flood, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology,
McGill University,
Montreal.

August, 1964

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The seventeen respondents who participated in this study are due recognition and thanks for the patient and co-operative manner in which they submitted to long interview sessions during the course of their normal duties. Mr. George Munro, General Chairman of the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Union, the senior union officer at the Angus Shops, deserves special mention for his assistance and advice while the field work was in progress. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company provided access to the plant and freedom to observe at will and gratitude is expressed to them on this account. Mr. W. D. Dickie, Chief of Motive Power and Rolling Stock and Mr. L. D. Gray, General Supervisor of Apprentice Training are thanked for the provision of facilities and for making arrangements for visits to the plant. Mr. G. C. Tompkins, Works Manager at the Angus Shops was especially helpful both in discussions and in facilitating interview sessions during working hours.

At one point or another almost every member of the Department of Sociology has shown an interest in the study. They are thanked for their advice and encouragement. Dr. Raymond Breton must receive special thanks for the guidance, direction, and encouragement which he freely gave over the whole period that the study was in progress.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
	LIST OF TABLES	vi
	INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter		
I	THE SETTING	4
	The Plant and the Employees	
	The Contract and the Rules of Service	
	The Key Roles and Union Autonomy	
	The Formal Hierarchies	
	General Environmental Factors	
II	THE RESEARCH DESIGN	15
III	ASPECTS OF THE RELATIONSHIPS	20
	1. The Incidence of Contact in the Relationships	
	(a) The Incidence of Contact and Potential Grievance Rejection	
	2. The Content of Collective Bargaining	
	3. The Informal Norm of Non-Referral	
	(a) Concessions and Maintenance of the Norm	
	(b) Common Support of the Norm at the Plant Level	
	4. Sentiments Related to the Accommodation Process	
IV	PATTERNS OF ACCOMMODATION IN FOUR SELECTED AREAS	41
	Treaty-Making - The Basis of Accommodation	
	(1) Accommodations on the Application of Discipline	
	(2) Accommodations on the Application of Seniority	
	(3) Accommodations on the Hiring, Firing, and Lay-off of Men	
	(4) Behaviour Related to Areas not Covered by the Formal Agreement	

	Page
Chapter V	
TWO CASE STUDIES - THE TWO EXTREMES . . .	74
1. Relationship A - The Most Harmonious Relationship	
2. Relationship Gx - The Least Harmonious Relationship	
3. Contrasting Aspects of the Two Extreme Cases	
VI	
CONCLUSIONS	94
APPENDIX A	99
Characteristics of the Respondents	
APPENDIX B	103
Schedule B-1	
Interview Schedule for Supervisors	
Schedule B-2	
Interview Schedule for Union Officers	
Schedule B-3	
Interview Schedule for both Supervisors and Union Officers	
APPENDIX C	113
Trade Unions Represented by the Respondents	
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	115

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
I	NUMBER OF RELATIONSHIP ROLES HELD BY EACH KEY ROLE OCCUPANT	17
II	REPORTED FREQUENCY OF "HAVING DEALINGS" WITH THE OTHER PARTY TO THE RELATIONSHIP IN AN AVERAGE WEEK	21
III	RATE OF RELATIONSHIP INTERACTION AND RATE OF POTENTIAL GRIEVANCE REJECTION AS REPORTED BY UNION OFFICER	22
IV	NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES REFERRED HIGHER THAN THE RELATIONSHIP LEVEL IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE- MONTH PERIOD	28
V	ASSESSMENT OF RELATIONSHIP PARTNER'S CO- OPERATIVENESS	37
VI	FOREMEN'S GENERAL ATTITUDE TOWARD DEALING WITH UNION OFFICERS	38
VII	CROSS-REPORT AND SELF-REPORT ON WHETHER FOREMEN SEEK ADVICE ON PROBLEMS FROM THEIR UNION PARTNERS	39
VIII	ACCOMMODATIONS OF FOREMEN ON THE APPLICATION OF DISCIPLINE AS REPORTED BY FOREMEN AND UNION OFFICERS	50
IX	UNION OFFICERS' ACCOMMODATIONS ON THE APPLICATION OF SENIORITY	58
X	FOREMEN'S ACCOMMODATIONS ON THE APPLICATION OF SENIORITY	61
XI	COMPARISON OF IDEAL NON-ACCOMMODATIVE RESPONSES AND ACTUAL DOMINANT RESPONSES ON SENIORITY BY SEPARATE ITEM	65
XII	CONTRASTING ASPECTS OF THE TWO EXTREME RELATIONSHIPS	86
XIII	REPORTED ETHNIC ORIGIN AND LANGUAGE USED IN RELATIONSHIP INTERACTION	101

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

A recent study of the local union-management relationship in forty-one plants in the United States¹ stated in its conclusions that a number of challenging questions remained to be answered. One of these was identified as the problem of the effect of different collective bargaining structures upon the relationship. It was posed in the following terms:

"It has been hypothesized by some observers and participants that the structure within which the union-management accommodation process occurs has a significant effect on the quality of the relationship and its results. The controversy over local versus industry-wide bargaining implicitly involves this hypothesis. To what degree is the type of relationship determined by the bargaining structure? What difference does it make to the local establishment if the basic standards are formulated outside of the establishment by outside management and union representatives?"²

This study is concerned with this problem. It is a case study of the local union-management relationship in a plant where the basic standards are formulated by outside management

-
1. Milton Derber, W. E. Chalmers and R. Stagner, The Local Union-Management Relationship, (University of Illinois: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1960).
 2. Ibid., 122-3.

and union representatives. An attempt has been made to describe and interpret the character of the relationship which prevails where this structural condition is present. Those involved in the local union-management relationship are not involved in the processes of collective bargaining which determine the basic standards and conditions governing the formal relationship. They are nevertheless involved in an interactive process which shall be called a process of accommodation.

Furthermore, the plant studied had eight identifiable units or departments which provided a basis for comparison of the variations in the union-management relationship within a common structure. The presence of the following factors made this possible:

- (a) the key relationships determining the character of the accommodation processes and the tone of the union-management relationship were identified as those involving the union shop chairmen and the shop foremen;
- (b) each of these key relationships was located in a separate shop or department in the plant;
- (c) each shop foreman had a measure of independence which permitted him to make decisions relating to the accommodation process and affecting the key relationship;
- (d) each union shop chairman had almost complete independence permitting him to make decisions relating to the accommodation process and affecting the key relationship;

- (e) a different union held jurisdiction in each of the shops. While a common contract governed the formal union-management relations in the plant, the informal processes of accommodation in each shop were determined, on the union side, by a representative of a different union for each of the eight shops covered in the study.

No attempt has been made to compare the patterns of union-management relationships in this plant to similar ones in other plants or to ones in plants which conduct their collective bargaining at the local level. The tools which will facilitate such comparisons are still in the process of development.

This study is mainly concerned with identification of the accommodative process which occurs in the plant. Such accommodations are made by the partners in the key relationships which are identified as the union shop chairmen and the shop foremen. Those who occupy these roles are able to make accommodations to each other by the latitude that they permit in the interpretation or application of the formal contract in their day-to-day interaction.

CHAPTER I

THE SETTING

The Plant and the Employees

The plant selected for this case study is known as the Angus Shops and is located in the eastern part of Montreal. These shops are the main railway workshops of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and consist of a complex of some eight industrial units or departments. Their main function is the manufacture and maintenance of all kinds of railway equipment and rolling stock. A wide range of skilled craftsmen and other workers are employed in this plant; the crafts range from those of dyeing and upholstering to those of machinist and blacksmith work. The manufacture and repair of railway passenger cars and equipment also constitutes a considerable proportion of the production at the Angus Shops.

Each major department or shop is a more or less independent and identifiable unit although some of the shops co-operate in the production and repair of certain kinds of units. For example, the steel wheel shop provides their product to the various departments as required. The shops which are covered in this study, and which constitute the environments for the various union-management relationships, are:

1. Freight Car Shop;
2. Passenger Car Shop;
3. Diesel Locomotive Shop;
4. Blacksmith Shop;
5. Electrical Shop;
6. Sheet Metal Shop;
7. Boiler Shop;
8. Pipefitting and Maintenance Shop.

The range of job classifications involved in this study includes boilermakers, pipefitters, sheet metal workers, electrical workers, blacksmiths, machinists, carmen, helpers, and labourers. The employees are members of seven different international trade unions³ according to the craft which they follow. Most employees are members of their respective unions. A small percentage of workers are not union members but they are obliged to pay union dues under the check-off system which has been negotiated into the contract that covers all railway employees in the shopcraft trades. One of the unions represents the labourers who work throughout the shops. The other six trade unions represent workers in specific trade groups and these workers are, for the most part, located in particular trade shops. An exception to this is the maintenance department where the workers tend to be distributed throughout a variety of shops in the plant.

3. See Appendix C.

The Contract and the Rules of Service

The formal labour-management relations in this plant are governed by Wage Agreement No. 15. The holder of the contract, on the union side, is an administrative union body entitled Division No. 4, Railway Employees' Department, A.F. of L. - C.I.O. The contract is a national document: it sets the wages and working conditions for all non-operating railway workers in Canada with all of the major railway companies. The union officers in the Angus Shops play no active part in the negotiation of this contract, nor do the supervisors or management of the plant.

The significance of this structural aspect is that the contract is a "foreign" document to both parties at the plant level. It may be said that plant management have absolutely no say in the determination of the formal contract. The same applies to the employees and the union officers in the plant; the only point at which either the local union officers or the members would have an opportunity of actually participating in the negotiating process would be in the event that they were balloted in connection with a proposed strike. It is clear that neither the plant management, supervisors, union officers or members have any effective voice in the settlement of the formal contract governing their relationship.

The contract sets remunerations, hours of work, vacations, and all the basic matters of the work relationship.

In addition to this, however, Wage Agreement No. 15 lays out some 169 rules relating to a wide range of matters bearing on the labour-management relationship. The most crucial of these are the rules relating to seniority, but it covers a wide variety of minor things as well. These rules have been negotiated and built into the contract over many years. They are not now susceptible to change because the national negotiations do not deal with matters unless they apply to all classifications of workers. The result of this is that the rules of service have become frozen and the only changes which take place in the contract from time to time are those relating to wages, vacations, and suchlike. The wage agreement governing the formal relations at the plant level is therefore a combination of basic conditions of service which are set at the national level and a large number of rules of service governing formal relations at the plant level which have been unchanged over a long period of time.

The implications of this condition for both parties, at the plant level, is that their formal relationship is governed by a contract which may be summarized as having the following characteristics:

- (a) the contract agreement is a "foreign" document to both parties at the plant level in that neither local union officers nor local management officers have any significant voice in determining the terms or content of the basic agreement;

- (b) the rules of service associated with the agreement are not subject to revision or change. Both parties at the higher levels are reluctant to open up the rules for revision.

At the plant level the parties have the responsibility of administering a contract which is rigid and inflexible and which only appears to change in matters relating to such basic matters as wages and vacations. It is in the interpretation and administration of the contract that the parties, at the plant level, have an opportunity to influence the nature of their relationships.

The Key Roles and Union Autonomy

Each union has jurisdiction over its own members. The general pattern is that the bulk of the members of any one union are located in a single department. The consequence of this is that each department is primarily concerned with a single union. The key role on the union side is that of union shop chairman; on the management side that of shop foreman. Thus, the key relationships in the plant are those of union shop chairman with shop foreman. Eight major relationships of this type are covered in this study.⁴ These relate to all of the major departments or shops in the plant.

Each union operates in a fairly autonomous fashion in its day-to-day affairs in the plant although officers from different unions do consult daily on an informal basis. The seven unions have a formal structure for joint action which holds

4. For full details on this see Appendix A: "Characteristics of the Respondents."

meetings once a month outside the plant. This is a body known as The Federated Trades of the Canadian Pacific Railway Employees, Montreal Council. This organization, which is generally referred to as "The Federation," is composed of delegates from each of the unions. Problems relating to general conditions in the plant are raised and discussed at the meetings of this organization and are taken to the works manager by the officers of the federation. Most of the federation officers are also shop chairmen.

Only in matters of the above nature do the unions in the plant act jointly. All other grievances and problems that employees might have are dealt with in an autonomous manner by the individual union concerned. For example, if a shop chairman is dissatisfied with the disposal of a grievance at the works manager level he does not raise this matter with the federation but channels it to the General Chairman of his own union. The General Chairman for each union is typically a full-time officer who maintains an office outside the plant and is responsible for the administration of a whole region. He is called in by the local officers in the plant only in matters of extreme difficulty. The day-to-day work of administering the contract is almost exclusively that of the shop chairman for each craft in consultation with his local committee of delegates.

On the management side the appropriate or corresponding role is that held by the shop foreman. It should be noted that the shop foreman is not in a position to act in such an autonomous fashion as his relationship partner due to the fact that he is in

immediate and constant contact with his superiors, i.e., the assistant works managers and the works manager.

The Formal Hierarchies

Each union has an elected shop chairman; there is one exception where the shop chairman is appointed by higher union officers outside the plant. Each union also has a number of shop committeemen or delegates who are elected. The shop committee is comprised of the delegates and the shop chairman and is the formal executive body in the shop. As has already been noted the union shop chairman holds the key union role in the shop. He is the officer who acts for the union in all matters in the plant, especially on matters involving interaction with supervisors and higher plant management. He has a strong influence within his committee on whether or not a complaint will be processed. He has a great deal of influence on the decision of how far grievances will be pressed and the tactics which will be used in dealing with supervisors and higher plant management. The delegates or committeemen deal with matters on the shop floor between members and assistant foremen. However, if a matter which arises on the shop floor is of a serious nature, or cannot be satisfactorily disposed of, then the delegate brings it to the attention of the local committee. From there it may be taken up by the shop chairman and processed with the appropriate supervisors or members of plant higher management.

The union shop chairman tends to deal with the following hierarchy of management:

1. Shop Foreman;
2. General Shop Foreman;
3. Assistant Works Manager;
4. Works Manager.

If a complaint or grievance is not satisfactorily resolved at the plant level, a most unusual occurrence, then the union shop chairman must turn the matter over to his General Chairman who will take it up with higher management above the plant level. At this point the shop chairman drops out of the case. This is a union practice which some union chairmen commented on adversely when they were being interviewed.

The managerial hierarchy in the plant has the following complement and structure:

- 1 Works Manager.
- 2 Assistant Works Managers.
- 3 General Shop Foremen.

- 1 Shop Foreman for each shop or department.

In addition, there are a considerable number of assistant foremen which is related to the size of the workforce in each department. For the purposes of this study, the assistant foremen do not occupy significant supervisory roles. The important roles, on the supervisory side, are those occupied by the three general shop foremen and five of the shop foremen. The general shop foremen

differ from the shop foremen only in that they either have jurisdiction over a very large department or they have responsibility for co-ordinating the production of a number of departments or sub-departments.

General Environmental Factors

Apart from the structural factors outlined above there are three general environmental factors which tend to promote stability in the union-management relationships in this plant. First, this plant differs from some industrial plants in that it is not engaged in a competitive operation; the product is not in competition with similar products on an open market. The plant operates on the basis of a budget which is handed down from the head office of the company. This budget determines the levels of production, repairs, and maintenance and this, in turn, determines the level of employment. It seems reasonable to infer from this that the pattern of employment is more stable than is general in outside, competitive industry. The Angus Shops' operation is an expense item for the company, being solely involved in the manufacture and maintenance of its equipment. That this is a correct interpretation of the situation is confirmed by reference to Rule 35 in the contract agreement which states:

"When it becomes necessary to make a reduction in expenses at any point, four (4) working days' notice shall be given to the men affected before reduction is made" (")

(") Underlining the author's.

A second general factor of some significance is the age-group composition of the workforce. The proportion of older men is unusually high. In 1960, the associated railway unions presented evidence to a federal board of conciliation which demonstrated that non-operating railway workers, in general, tended to have unusually long service records with their companies: more than 50% of employees in the group had worked for their company for more than ten years. Comparable data were not available for the employees in Angus Shops but it was evident, from participant observation, that an unusually high proportion of the men were in the latter segment of their working careers. It was estimated by the unions that about 25 to 33% of the employees in the plant qualified for a four-week annual vacation which requires twenty-five years of service with the company. Since it was shown in 1960 that 20.7% of all railway non-operating employees had at least twenty-five years of service, the estimate for the plant being studied seems to be feasible. Union officers were aware of the skewed pattern of the plant's labour force in relation to the age variable. Some complained that the unions were faced with difficult problems not only because they had too many "old men" but because they had a lot of "sick men" who needed light jobs and that not sufficient of these were available.

The weighting of the workforce toward long service men would seem to be another factor favouring stable union-management relations. The nine union shop chairmen who were interviewed had an average service record of 31.7 years and the eight foremen in

the sample had an average of 40.0 years service with the company. These records are well above the average in general industry.

A third factor which might be regarded as contributing to stability in the plant is an inter-generational family tradition. This tradition is recognized in the contract agreement:

"Rule 50. . . . In the selection of apprentices, sons of employees shall be given special consideration."

It proved to be impossible to establish the strength of this factor but respondents confirmed that a considerable number of employees had sons or other relatives employed in the plant.

Apart from the structural features, previously outlined, we have at least three general factors which bear relevance to the union-management relationship. These factors, which would all seem to point to stability in the relationship, are:

- (a) the non-competitive character of the enterprise;
- (b) the higher than average proportion of long-service men in the plant's workforce;
- (c) the inter-generational family tradition in the workforce.

CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

The exploratory stage of this study involved discussions with union officers at a higher level than the plant. This was followed by visits to the plant for discussions with the union officers, the plant manager, and the shop foremen. Gradually, it became clear that there was something rather unusual about the union-management relations in the Angus Shops. Observations showed, for example, that a number of the union officers had no responsibilities for production work and that they appeared to spend a great deal of their time on union-related work. It was also observed that some of the unions had established "unofficial" but permanent union offices within the plant. This was felt to be unusual and in need of explanation. The general dependency of shop foremen upon union officers was also noted and explanations for this were sought in wide-ranging interviews with shop foremen and union officers. There appeared to be strong evidence that the informal accommodation process rather than the union contract was the primary factor in the determination of the labour-management relations in the plant and that this was located primarily in the union shop-chairman-shop foreman relationship. Contract negotiations which normally have a great bearing on the union-management relationship seemed to have little significance

here. The accommodation process in the union shop chairman-shop foreman relationships became the centre of interest as the key relationship in understanding union-management relations.

An interview schedule⁵ was prepared as a basic tool of investigation. It was largely made up of open-ended questions and although most of the questions put to union shop chairmen and shop foremen were identical there were some variations. In some cases queries were put to the respondents on one side of the relationships which were not put to the other.

Apart from the interviews a great deal was learned from participant observation. More than twenty days were spent in the plant and during that time it was possible to go anywhere completely unescorted. Many of the respondents also took part in supplementary discussions which helped to clear up ambiguities.

The schedule which was used was fairly wide-ranging. Its core, however, was concerned with three major areas of interest:

- (a) the content, frequency, range, and sources of origin of accommodations;
- (b) sentiments surrounding the accommodation process; and
- (c) sentiments of the respondents to their partners in the process.

While the key relationships and the key roles had been identified there was one problem in this connection. It had been noted in the exploratory studies that most of the key role occupants had

5. See Appendix B-1, B-2, B-3.

a partnership relationship with several people on the "other side." Seven of the shop foremen were partners in two relationships each, and the other foreman was a partner in five such relationships. Similarly, only one union shop chairman was a partner in one relationship. The rest were partners in two or more relationships. These observations for all the relationships are summarized in Table I.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF RELATIONSHIP ROLES HELD BY EACH KEY ROLE OCCUPANT

Specified Union Shop Chairman - Shop Foreman Relationship	TOTAL NUMBER OF RELATIONSHIPS HELD BY:	
	Union Shop Chairman with Plant Officers	Shop Foreman with Union Officers
A	5	2
B	4	2
C	2	2
D	4	2
E	2	2
F	5	5
G	2	2
Gx	1	2

These responses indicate, for example, that union officer (A) whose major relationship is with foreman (A) also has dealings with four other supervisors from time to time, whereas foreman (A) has dealings with only one other union officer. The wider

range of relationships that union officers have is partly due to the fact that in the course of processing a grievance they are liable to deal with several supervisors in the management hierarchy. It is also partly due to the fact that a foreman's main responsibility and area of jurisdiction tends to be located in a single shop whereas some union shop chairmen have members employed in different shops.

To determine the key relationships for each respondent a set of special questions was introduced at the beginning of the schedule. Union shop chairmen were asked to identify the number of supervisors with whom they interacted; they were then asked to nominate the supervisor with whom they had the most frequent interaction. They were then instructed to respond to the questions with this particular relationship in mind. Similarly, when the supervisors were interviewed they were asked to nominate the union officer with whom they had the most frequent interaction and instructed to respond in terms of this relationship. All of the cross-nominations correlated exactly.

The general approach in the interviews was to seek out patterns in the accommodation process in the key relationships. This involved a search for patterns of deviation, concession, compromise and co-operation as reported by those occupying the key roles. It was realized that some of the areas being investigated might be "tender" areas for the respondents and that distorted responses might be expected. To overcome this the technique of cross-reporting was sometimes used, i.e., the

respondent was asked to report on his partner's behaviour or attitudes on certain aspects of the process. In some instances the respondent simply reported on his own behaviour and attitudes and in other instances the two techniques were combined.

Four major areas of possible accommodation were selected for special attention. It was felt that these four areas might likely reveal patterns of accommodation or deviation from the formal rules by both parties to the relationships. The areas selected were the application of discipline, the application of seniority, behaviour related to the hiring, firing and lay-off of men, and behaviour related to areas not covered by the formal agreement.

Apart from the interviews and participant observation it was possible to examine the records of one of the unions relating to grievances over a period of time. Observations were also made of the union officers at a meeting of their Trades Federation which meets once a month to discuss problems which relate to the whole plant.

CHAPTER III

ASPECTS OF THE RELATIONSHIPS

1. The Incidence of Contact in the Relationships

The content of the day-to-day interaction in the key relationships involves a great deal more than grievances. The interaction also involves contract interpretation and administration that does not constitute a grievance or even necessarily a problem. Another aspect of this interaction is that it sometimes results in an informal process of rule-making. This is evident from the reports of the respondents on their various "arrangements" and "understandings." That the interactions at the shop level do sometimes result in the establishment of rules is demonstrated by the concern some shop foremen expressed on the question of the establishment of precedents. They expressed the view that they found it mutually beneficial to make concessions, to reach understandings, and to make informal arrangements. They felt, however, that they had to be careful they did not create precedents which might be used against them in some way at a future date.

To understand the full meaning of the incidence of grievances being progressed higher than the key relationships a table is included at this point showing the reported frequency of interaction of all kinds at the shop level.

TABLE II
 REPORTED FREQUENCY OF "HAVING DEALINGS" WITH THE OTHER PARTY
 TO THE RELATIONSHIP IN AN AVERAGE WEEK

Relationship	Union	Foreman
A	Very Seldom	7
B	3	3
C	7	3
D	20	1
E	12	1
F	15	15
G	15	10
Gx	2	10

It will be noted that there was a great deal of disparity in the reported frequency of contact in most of the relationships. The form of the question lent itself to a variety of interpretations. The respondents were asked how often, on the average, they had dealings with their relationship partner in a week. "Having dealings" seems to have been interpreted by some as "having contact," by others as "having grievances." Only two of the eight relationships show agreement by both parties on the amount of contact. In four of the remaining relationships the union officer reports much more frequent interaction than his foreman partner; in the remaining two cases the foreman reports more frequent interaction than his union officer partner. On the basis of participant observation it may be inferred that

where there is a great disparity in the reports for a single relationship that one of the partners is reporting contact of any kind and the other is reporting contact based upon grievances.

(a) The Incidence of Contact and Potential Grievance Rejection

One of the ways in which the union officer may act to determine the nature of his relationship with his partner is related to his acceptance or rejection of potential grievances brought to him by his members. In the following table we compare the rate of interaction reported by the union officer with his performance in the rejection of potential grievances.

TABLE III

RATE OF RELATIONSHIP INTERACTION AND RATE OF POTENTIAL
GRIEVANCE REJECTION AS REPORTED BY UNION OFFICER

Relationship	Weekly Rate of Interaction	Percentage of Potential Grievances Rejected
A	Seldom	0
B	3	33
C	7	33
D	20	80
E	12	90
F	15	40
G	15	50
Gx	2	33

This shows that, generally, the higher the number of contacts the larger the percentage of grievances rejected. This may indicate that increased contact leads to recognition of the point of view of the relationship partner with the consequent rejection of marginal grievances brought up by the union members.

A very small proportion of the problems which arise are referred higher than the shop level. It is estimated, on the basis of the reports of the union respondents, that approximately five thousand items are dealt with in the eight key relationships in a year. Only one hundred and ten items were referred higher than the shop levels in the year preceding the study. This implies that there is a great deal of interaction in the relationships involving a variety of problems which are resolved by mutual concession or accommodation.

2. The Content of Collective Bargaining

The accommodation process is an integral part of the union-management relationship. It involves two quite distinct processes: the formal process of accommodation the end result of which is the contract and also the processes of contract interpretation, administration, and the day-to-day interactions which culminate in the establishment of informal arrangements. Collective bargaining is sometimes taken to exclude these latter informal processes of accommodation but a more meaningful view of the total process of collective bargaining must include them.

Harbison and Coleman⁶ include these processes in their definition of collective bargaining:

"Collective bargaining (i.e., the union-management relations) is a process involving relationships between representatives of the company and representatives of the workers. Though collective bargaining requires the interaction of persons as human-beings, it is primarily a treaty-making and treaty-enforcing process, . . . (it) is not just a system of human relations. It is primarily a power relationship between "interests." In a nutshell, union-management relationships involve the accommodation of institutions . . . the manner in which the two institutional organizations involved - the company and the union - learn to live together."

Derber et al., in their study, also regard the informal processes as a legitimate part of the accommodation process:

". . . We conceived the accommodation process as the interactions between the two groups in which, on the basis of the separate achievement standards among other things, agreement is reached as to the conditions of employment and as to the conduct of the joint relationship. Such agreement usually takes the form both of written documents and of informal rules."⁷

These latter authors point out that the rule-making process is most clearly observed in the negotiation of the labour contract but that rules may also be formulated or revised during the life of the contract to deal with new problems or conditions.

6. F. H. Harbison and J. R. Coleman, Goals and Strategy in Collective Bargaining (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), pp. 5-6.

7. Op. cit., p. 19.

In this connection a very revealing piece of interaction between a shop foreman and a union shop chairman was observed. The two respondents were discussing whether an apprentice was permitted, under the rules, to perform a certain type of work. There was a brief discussion of the rules in the agreement relating to the question then the union shop chairman said to the shop foreman: "A lot of these rules are obsolete - times are changing - let the apprentice do the work." This was a case of a rule being revised in the process of administration within the key relationship. It is unlikely that the original rule which was amended on this one occasion would ever be applied in its original form again. Derber et al. discuss this point and note:

" . . . New or revised rules may emerge out of the process of administering or giving specific application to the contract. No matter how detailed the contract may be, it obviously cannot supply all the specifications for concrete action. The parties may have to fill in rules consistent with the more general ones. The individuals involved may have achievement standards and perceptions different from those of the contract negotiators or may find themselves in circumstances which impel them to apply the rules quite differently than was intended, thereby, in effect, modifying them."⁸

It is this emergence of rules, filling in of rules, and modification of rules in the day-to-day relationship, at the plant level, that is of special interest here. The formal aspect of the union-management relations in the Angus Shops is governed by an agreement which defines rates of pay and conditions of service, and which is negotiated and determined by outside parties.

8. Ibid., pp. 22-3.

The informal aspects of union-management relations, however, are located in the accommodation processes of the eight key relationships in the plant involving the union shop chairmen and the shop foremen. While part of the total accommodation process involves the relationships between union shop chairmen and the works manager, this aspect of the process occurs infrequently and only in situations where the normal accommodation process has failed or broken down at the shop level and where either of the parties to the relationship in the shop chooses to pass the matter "out and up," i.e., outside the shop and higher up the hierarchy of authority. The accommodation process operates effectively at the shop level most of the time. The foremen are exceedingly reluctant to invoke higher authority to assist them in dealing with problems which involve the union shop chairman.

3. The Informal Norm of Non-Referral

In plants where full collective bargaining takes place the normal instrument of coercion introduced into the definition of the relationship between union and management is the threat of a strike. In the Angus Shops this factor is not present. The union officers here have found a substitute instrument of coercion which they can utilize to great effect in the achievement of their goals. This is the threat of referring disputed matters to higher levels. This instrument is used most often at the shop level to obtain concessions from the shop foreman but it is also employed at the plant level to obtain concessions

from the plant manager. The union officers indicated that they were quite well aware of the foremen's fear of disputes being referred above them. Most of them admitted that they used this instrument to obtain concessions. The union officers felt that the foremen were afraid of upward referral because it indicated that the foremen could not do their jobs properly.

The foremen, in general, took the view that coping with grievances and preventing problems from going "upstairs" were important aspects of their occupational role. Failure to resolve such things would be tantamount to an admission and demonstration of their inability to fill their role adequately. When foremen were pressed regarding their reluctance to refer problems to plant management frequent responses were that "the people upstairs have enough problems" or "management wouldn't like it."

The shop foremen believe that not only should they not refer problems to the plant management but that they should act, and are expected to act, through the manipulation of the accommodation process, to prevent the union officers from taking problems beyond the shop level.

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES REFERRED HIGHER THAN THE RELATIONSHIP LEVEL
IN THE PRECEDING TWELVE-MONTH PERIOD

Specified Union Shop Chairman - Shop Foreman Relationship	NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES PROGRESSED HIGHER THAN THE RELATIONSHIP BY:		Number of men in shop
	Union	Foreman	
A	0	0	73
B	3	2	350
C	12	0	200
D	6	0	300
E	2	3	112
F	5	1	890
G	50	0	500
Gx	24	2	1,600
TO TALS	102	8	

As can be seen in Table IV, four foremen reported that they had not passed any grievances up to higher authority in the twelve-month period preceding the study while the remaining four foremen had passed up a total of only eight items between them. The items which the foremen did pass up proved to be mainly matters of discipline.

The picture is rather different on the union side. Only one of the union shop chairmen had not taken grievances higher than the key relationship in the same period, whereas the distribution between the remaining seven union chairmen is highly

variable. One factor which might account for this variation is the size of the workforce in the various shops. Table II indicates that the incidence of failing to resolve problems at the relationship level, as expressed in the action of passing grievances "out and up," is not closely related to the size of the workforce in the shop. Since shop foremen take little initiative in this area, it may be that the variations constitute a response to a foreman's general attitudes by a union shop chairman. What these responses do provide is a clear measure of the effective operation of the accommodation process in each relationship since the act of passing a problem or grievance higher than the key relationship has to be regarded as a breakdown or failure of the accommodation process at the key relationship level. On this basis it is observed that relationships G, Gx, and C have a relatively high breakdown rate compared to the remainder. The general character of the relationships cannot be assessed solely on this basis, however, as there may be special conditions or circumstances prevailing in certain of the shops, quite apart from the character of the relationships, which might result in a comparatively high incidence of breakdown. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to infer that the rate of failure to resolve problems or grievances at the shop level is a general indicator of the accommodative content of the key relationships.

(a) Concessions and Maintenance of the Norm

The responses of the shop foremen, as a group, suggest that they are extremely reluctant to pass unresolved problems up to higher management. The union respondents also claimed that they were quite anxious to prevent grievances going higher than the shop. Some of the union shop chairmen, however, indicated that they frequently used the threat of passing grievances higher to force concessions from their relationship partners.

Respondents were asked to report on the attitude of their relationship partner to grievances being passed higher than the shop in which they originated. Most of the respondents, on either side, were prepared to make concessions to their partners to keep the problem within the relationship at the shop level. Only one shop foreman (relationship E) was not anxious to prevent grievances going higher. Only two union shop chairmen were reported, by their relationship partners, not to be anxious to prevent grievances going higher (relationships G and Gx). The foremen in all of the relationships, with the exception of Gx, were reported to be willing to concede a point to the union to have a problem settled at the shop level. All of the union shop chairmen were reported to be willing to concede a point to the foreman to have a problem settled at the shop level.

The areas in which union chairmen reported that foremen made concessions most often were in relation to the transfer and location of men and in matters involving discipline. Foremen

reported that union chairmen made concessions most often in the rule relating to the equal spreading of overtime and the assignment and transfer of men. One foreman was reported to be prepared to make concessions in all areas if the union threatened to pass the matter higher.

The fact that some items are referred above the relationship level indicates that there are some items about which the respondents feel more strongly than others.⁹ Union chairmen reported that foremen were least willing to make concessions to the union on matters of discipline of a serious nature and in the application of safety rules but two foremen were prepared to make concessions in all areas (relationships A and Gx); this seems reasonable for relationship A in which there were no grievances passed higher in the last year but not for relationship Gx in which there were twenty-four items passed higher. Six foremen reported that their union partners would not make concessions in areas relating to the application of the seniority rules. Only one foreman reported that there were no areas in which his partner would not concede.

The foremen's responses indicated that they did not regard themselves as strictly part of the plant "management." They made frequent references to "the people upstairs" and "plant management" when they were talking about the assistant works

9. The extent of conformity to the norm of non-referral is dealt with in detail in the next chapter where the pattern of concessions in four selected areas is examined.

managers and the plant manager. The union respondents also frequently referred to the plant managers as the "people upstairs." This appellation was confined, by respondents on both sides of the relationships, to the three top managerial officers in the plant as both groups referred to the head office management as "the people at Windsor Street." Despite the fact that over one hundred items were not settled at the shop levels in a one-year period it is evident that at the shop level and at the plant level there are strong feelings which are held by all of the respondents that problems should be contained at the local level and at the shop level if possible. It is also evident that the foremen in the shops had exceedingly strong feelings on this matter and were prepared to go to some lengths in the matter of concessions to contain problems within their own jurisdictions, and that the union officers clearly understood the situation and utilized it to obtain concessions from their relationship partners.

(b) Common Support of the Norm at the Plant Level

Seeking some indications of an extension of this practice to the point where it might be regarded as an indicator of a "plant culture" or a "plant psychology" all of the respondents were asked if they felt that those who occupied the key relationship roles should co-operate to have problems settled at the plant level, i.e., to prevent problems being referred to the head office. There was a closing of the ranks in the responses to this question. The attitudes of the shop foremen correlated with their previous responses that problems should be contained

at the lowest possible level of the administrative hierarchy. Union officers, on the other hand, did not limit themselves so narrowly although they did place limits on how far they felt they should go. Thus, they were prepared to refer grievances above the shop level and to utilize threats to do so in order to obtain concessions, but they drew the line when it came to taking grievances higher than the plant. The following are typical of their attitudes:

"Trouble should be kept in the family.
We will only go 'outside' if it is a
grave injustice."

"It is better to wash your dirty clothes
in your own house."

"What happens at Angus Shops should stay
at Angus Shops. We should keep the
outsiders out."

"The less they know at the other place,
the better."

Five union respondents reported that 100% of the grievances that they referred to the works manager were settled at that level. The others reported that they managed to settle 99%, 98%, and 66%. Thus, few items ever get outside the plant. It was reported that the plant manager was prepared to make concessions to achieve a settlement at the plant level in most things. The areas which the union respondents identified as ones in which the plant manager would not make concessions were discipline cases involving intoxication, jurisdictional problems between unions, and compensation cases. Seven of the union officers described their relationship with the works manager as "very good," one as "first class" and the other as "good."

The general situation in the key relationships is one in which there is pressure on the shop foremen to contain and solve their problems at the shop level. It may be that part of this pressure is subjectively felt and arises out of the foremen's conception of the requirements of their roles. However, the solidity and generality of the foremen's attitudes on this matter suggests that pressure is being brought to bear on them from above to deal with their problems with the union officers at the shop level. Whatever its source, the pressure is both general and real. It influences both the attitudes and consequent behaviour of the foremen and has an end product of concessions to the union. In the key relationships, the unions have been able to develop an instrument of coercion which has its origins, perhaps, in higher management attitudes to the performance of the foreman role in the shops. The foremen's fear of grievances being referred higher is one of the main instruments of coercion in the hands of the union officer in the shop and the responses suggest that not only is it used and threatened but that this is done to some effect in most of the relationships. While union officers are prepared to progress certain matters beyond the shop level an attitude comes into operation at the point where resistance might force them to proceed higher than the plant. Beyond the plant gate is another world.

Despite the constant availability of higher union officers, they are seldom called in to progress grievances higher

than the plant. There are a number of reasons for this: first, the manager is reported to be prepared to concede on many things; second, the relationship between the union officers and the plant manager is reported to be very good; third, there is general acknowledgement by the union officers that the manager has his problems with the "people at Windsor Street." Union officers also were anxious to point out that the present manager "served his time in this plant and has worked his way up." All of these things do not, of course, add up to proof of the existence of a "plant culture" but they are sufficiently impressive to suggest why the atmosphere is such that both sides are prepared to concede to prevent disputed matters passing outside their jurisdiction. This, particularly, when matters referred above the plant level will be handled by outside union officers and outside management people. At this point the union officer is aware that he will lose control of the case. He is aware that he will no longer be able to offer to trade maintenance of the informal norm of non-referral in exchange for concessions.

4. Sentiments Related to the Accommodation Process

The evidence presented establishes that there is frequent contact between the key role occupants; that concessions are made by both parties, and that these are more or less effective in containing problems at the shop level. Beyond such problems there is a great deal of activity which is of an administrative or consultative nature. This raises the question of whether the accommodation process is, in fact, a homogeneous

process. Derber et al. also considered this point and made the undernoted observations:

"This discussion of rule-making and administration leads to the question as to whether 'the accommodation process' is really a single homogeneous process or whether it is in fact a number of interrelated but different processes. For example, we might not only distinguish the process for setting employment terms and the administrative process, but also subdivide the latter into two segments, the process in which the union shares administrative responsibility and the consultative process (the process through which management may impart information or seek union advice, although it does not give up decision-making responsibility)."10

The consultative process in the Angus Shops appeared to be very widely used by the shop foremen and it was observed that some of the respondents consulted with their relationship partners every morning as a matter of course. Although the foremen in our relationships do not necessarily give up their decision-making responsibilities they are well aware of the fact that the non-support of the union officer in a course of action might lead to the progression of a grievance and failure to maintain the informal norm of non-referral. This provides them with a strong incentive to discuss proposals with their union officers and to try and reach agreement with them on the course to be pursued. A number of questions were directed to the respondents to establish the attitudes surrounding this aspect of the relationship.

10. Op. cit., p. 24.

The shop foremen are very much the "men in the middle" and are aware that they are unlikely to get much support from higher plant management if they are responsible for labour problems getting outside their shops. All the respondents were first asked if they found their relationship partner to be co-operative.

TABLE V

ASSESSMENT OF RELATIONSHIP PARTNER'S CO-OPERATIVENESS

Union Reports Partner to be:	Foreman Reports Partner to be:	Number
Co-operative	Co-operative	4
Co-operative but Qualified	Co-operative	2
Non-Co-operative	Co-operative	1
Non-Co-operative but Qualified	Non-Co-operative	1

In half of the relationships both parties report unqualified co-operation. Only one foreman and one union officer reported that their partners were not co-operative. But three of the union officers gave qualified responses, two positive and one negative. On the whole there is a high degree of co-operation in the relationships.

The foremen were also asked how they felt about having to deal with union officers and this was cross-checked by asking the union officers what they thought their foreman felt about having to deal with union officers. These results are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI

FOREMEN'S GENERAL ATTITUDE TOWARD DEALING WITH UNION OFFICERS

Union Reports Partner to have:	Foreman Reports Self to have:	Number
Positive Attitude	Positive Attitude	3
Positive Attitude	Positive Attitude but Qualified	1
Positive Attitude but Qualified	Positive Attitude but Qualified	1
Negative Attitude	Positive Attitude but Qualified	1
Negative Attitude	Negative Attitude	2

Four of the union officers reported that their relationship partners had a positive attitude toward dealing with union officers; three reported a negative attitude, and the other reported a qualified positive attitude. Three foremen, on the basis of their self-reports, confirmed the positive expression of their partners; three gave qualified positive responses, and two gave negative responses. The two negative self-reports confirmed the negative expressions of the union officers in relationships E and Gx.

Elaborations of the responses in Table VII revealed a great deal about the general attitudes of the parties, especially regarding containment of problems in the shop. For example, the union officer in relationship B reported: "The foreman doesn't make a move without consulting me." The foreman in this relationship reported that he found it the best manner in clearing up

difficulties and that he would rather deal with the shop chairman than go upstairs. In relationship D the foreman stated: "Our relationship is very happy. I find the union officer an asset in the operation of the shop." In relationship G, the union reported that the shop foreman liked to talk things over with the union. The shop foreman himself said: "It is a good way to handle things. It is a good thing, they (the union officers) act as a 'go-between'." In relationship Gx where the union reported that the foreman did not like having to deal with the union, the foreman said: "We don't get along at all. At times I have to settle - because I don't want things to go upstairs. The management doesn't like foremen who bring up problems." However, our interest here was in trying to establish the incidence of the consultative process as part of the whole process of accommodation. The foremen were asked if they ever sought advice on their problems from their union partners. These responses were cross-checked through questions put to the union officers. The results are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII

CROSS-REPORT AND SELF-REPORT ON WHETHER FOREMEN SEEK ADVICE
ON PROBLEMS FROM THEIR UNION PARTNERS

Union Reports Partner	Foreman States He	Number
Seeks Advice	Seeks Advice	5
Seeks Advice	Does Not Seek Advice	2
Does Not Seek Advice	Does Not Seek Advice	1

The specific question which was put to the foremen was: "Do you ever seek advice from the union officers?" The question which was put to the union officers for the purpose of obtaining a cross-report was: "When the foreman has problems does he ever come and ask you what you think should be done?" All of the union officers with one exception reported that the foreman consulted with them when they had problems. The union officer in relationship E qualified his response by saying that the foreman consulted him "at times." The union officer in relationship Gx said that the foreman did not consult him and this response was confirmed by the foreman's statement. Although the union officer in relationship F said that the foreman consulted him this was denied by the foreman. He reported: "No, I don't seek advice. I get them in here and tell them what I am going to do - which is always by schedule - so I don't have to worry." The foreman in relationship B also denied the union officer's report. He claimed that it was not wise to seek advice "when you are the boss." The foremen in relationships D and G qualified their positive responses, the former claimed that he only sought advice from the union officer on a matter that related to contract interpretation and the latter admitted that he sought advice "but only occasionally." Consultation took place in most of the relationships on a regular basis but some of the foremen were reluctant to admit that they seek advice from and consult with their union officers. The extensive consultation which occurs is related to the foremen's strong motivation to observe the norm of non-referral and to contain problems within their own shops.

CHAPTER IV

PATTERNS OF ACCOMMODATION IN FOUR SELECTED AREAS

Treaty-Making - The Basis of Accommodation

The basis of the accommodation process is treaty-making. This phenomenon is based upon the fact that both parties in the relationships have needs which can only be met outside of the formal rules. For example, the shop foremen need a degree of flexibility in filling vacancies which arise in their shops. The union officers have a need to see that some of their members who have physical disabilities be given premium jobs which they do not qualify for under the seniority rules. Thus, the union officers can grant the foremen a degree of flexibility in exchange for certain employees being given premium jobs on compassionate grounds.

This aspect of the relationships provides the best illustration of the treaty-making which is characteristic of the whole accommodation process. It is inextricably bound up with the situational factor that both parties to the relationships have needs which cannot be adequately met within the formal rule structure. By permitting latitude in the application of the formal rules each party can, to some extent, meet the needs of his partner. It is in this respect that the processes of accommodation can be best understood.

What are these needs? The foremen have a need to contain problems within their own shops as such containment is an important part of their adequate role performance. This need cannot be met without co-operation from their union partners. It is only with such co-operation that the norm of non-referral can be maintained and the intervention of plant management in shop matters prevented. Successful containment guarantees that the shop foremen will be regarded as "good foremen" by the plant management. The union officers, on the other hand, have a need to obtain certain concessions, outside the formal rules, for their "constituents." These officers are, in a sense, "industrial politicians" who are subject to the vicissitudes of regular elections. They enjoy their "union jobs" in the plant and are anxious to please their constituents. They cannot obtain the favours that they require within the strict application of the formal rules. They can obtain them on the basis of accommodations with their shop foremen. Such favours are important to the union officers as their astute distribution helps to guarantee their re-election.

Each party in a relationship can act to support or undermine the status of his partner. If the union officer fails to co-operate with the foreman to maintain the norm of non-referral then the foreman loses status in the eyes of plant management. If the foreman fails to grant adequate concessions and favours to the union shop chairman then the union officer loses status in the eyes of his constituents.

A complete breakdown of the accommodation process might lead to the replacement of the foreman and the electoral defeat of the union officer. Both would be "reduced to the ranks" and would lose their respective positions of privilege and high status. Thus, there are strong motivations on both sides for support of the informal norm on the basis of treaty-making that meets the needs of both partners which cannot be met through the formal rules.

When a problem is referred to the plant management by the foreman this constitutes a demonstration of his inability to fill his role. The foreman demonstrates inability and loses status when he fails to handle a matter at the shop level, and when a union officer calls in an outside officer we have a demonstration of the same thing. This explains why the union officer will, on occasion, press a matter to the level of the plant manager but not beyond that. At the plant level, the manager is in the same position as the shop foreman is in at the shop level. This explains the wide-ranging concessions which he makes to prevent matters going outside his jurisdiction. The norm of non-referral appears to be associated with the structural condition that head office and plant are separated. The autonomy of the plant is secure so long as the operations are running smoothly. Part of the operations are harmonious labour relations. If labour relations are unharmonious at the shop level the status and autonomy of the shop foreman is threatened. If they are unharmonious at the plant level the status and autonomy of the plant managers are threatened. By judicious concession and treaty-

making good relations can be maintained and the status of the foremen and the managers secured. Autonomy, in such circumstances is not threatened.

The union officers are prepared to observe the norm of non-referral so long as their needs are met in return. Their status partly depends upon obtaining concessions. These do not have to be obtained at the shop level but they must be obtained at the plant level. To go beyond this means calling in an outside union officer and to do so involves the abrogation of their autonomy.

The maintenance of status and autonomy for all of the parties is served through observation of the norm of non-referral. Both parties have needs which lie outside the formal rules but which may be met through the accommodation process. This process, however, can only operate so long as the autonomy of the plant is maintained; outside parties from either side would be likely to enforce the formal rules.

As noted in Chapter II, four areas of activity were selected as being likely to reveal significant patterns of accommodation involving deviation from the formal rules by one or both parties to the key relationships:

- (1) the application of discipline;
- (2) the application of seniority;
- (3) behaviour related to the hiring, firing, and lay-off of men; and
- (4) behaviour related to areas not covered by the formal agreement.

(1) Accommodations on the Application of Discipline

There are no specific references to matters of discipline in the wage agreement and such questions, therefore, must be regarded as falling within the area of the managerial prerogative. The formal disciplinary system which prevails in the plant is one which utilizes the allocation of demerit marks to employees who are caught breaking company rules and regulations: these demerits are entered into an employee's record. Acts such as loafing during working hours, smoking in prohibited areas, leaving the job before time, eating during working hours, and being under the influence of intoxicating beverages, are examples of such infractions. An employee is supposed to be automatically fired if he collects a total of sixty demerit marks within a given period.

Demerit marks are normally meted out by assistant foremen on the shop floor. The matter is then normally passed on to the shop foreman. At this point the employee has to sign a form accepting the demerit marks which have been meted out to him; then they are entered into records. Thus, formally, the process of discipline is automatic, rigid, located at the shop level, and exclusively the prerogative of the supervisory staff. It should be noted that while an assistant foreman may initially act to discipline an employee it is the shop foreman who acts to have the demerits entered into the employees' record. It is at this point that the accommodation process comes into play.

There is only one rule in the wage agreement which, even in a general way, relates to the handling of disciplinary problems from the union point of view:

"Rule 44. Should any employee subject to this Agreement believe he has been unjustly dealt with, or that any of the provisions of this Agreement have been violated (which he is unable to adjust directly) the case shall be taken to the Foreman, General Foreman, Shop Superintendent, Works Manager, or Master Mechanic, each in their respective order, by the Local Committee or one or more duly authorized members thereof, and a decision will be rendered without any unnecessary delay."

Despite this rule, power in this area is almost exclusively in the hands of the shop foremen as they decide whether demerits will be passed on to the records office. It is unlikely that an employee will be accorded demerit marks if he has not been seen indulging in an infraction of the rules. Since the onus would be upon the union officer to prove that the man involved was being unjustly dealt with he would, under other circumstances, have a poor case due to the fact that both infractions and their penalties are clearly defined. However, in this plant the accommodation process comes into operation at this point.

It emerged from the interviews that the position which the union officers usually adopt in discipline cases is that of making a plea for leniency. They ask that the demerit marks be not entered in the employee's record or that the number of demerit marks that have been meted out to the employee be reduced. It was

clear from the responses of all the respondents that there is considerable deviation from the formal rules in the application of discipline. Thus, union officers and foremen can achieve accommodation with one another in one of the following ways:

- (a) neglecting to apply the regulations and ignoring infractions of them;
- (b) warning employees who have been observed indulging in infractions;
- (c) having the union officer warn employees;
- (d) shop foremen failing to record demerits accorded by their assistants;
- (e) shop foremen reducing or "scrubbing-out" demerits accorded by their assistants.

Accommodations (a), (b), and (c) are normally initiated by the shop foreman and accommodations (d) and (e) usually take place as a result of the intervention of the union officer.

It was also reported that the plant manager made concessions in the application of discipline. This was liable to occur when a shop foreman refused to make concessions and the union officer was prepared to press the matter. Respondents could only recall a few times in the past decade when an employee had been fired. The only area in which the plant manager was reported to be unwilling to make concessions was in cases that involved intoxication.

It is important to recognize that accommodations in the application of discipline do not involve any direct "treaty-making"

or barter. According to the agreement and the formal rules governing discipline, discipline is an area of exclusive management rights. Nevertheless, accommodations are made by both shop foremen and the plant manager. It is reasonable to infer that the supervisors make concessions in this area in the interests of maintaining a good relationship with their union shop chairmen and perhaps with the hope of obtaining concessions from the union officers in other areas where management does not hold an exclusive prerogative.

Table VIII, which follows, has been drawn up on the basis of responses to the interview schedule. First of all a scale of strictness was calculated from the responses to the following two questions:

- (3/29) How strict are you on the application of discipline?
- (3/29) How strict is the supervisor on the application of discipline?

In terms of the general responses to these questions each of the foremen was given a high, medium or low rating in respect to the degree of strictness with which he applies the formal rules relating to the application of discipline.

The factors of deviation from the rules by the foremen, making concessions to the union, and co-operating with the union officers on matters of discipline were calculated on the basis of the responses to the following questions:

- (3/30) Do you ever deviate from the
"letter of the law" on this?
- (3/31) Do you ever make concessions
to the union on this? Why?
- (3/32) Do you sometimes manage to work
things out together on this?

The above questions were put to the foremen and a corresponding set of questions were put to their partners for the purposes of obtaining a cross-check of the responses.

TABLE VIII

ACCOMMODATIONS OF FOREMEN ON THE APPLICATION OF DISCIPLINE
AS REPORTED BY FOREMEN AND UNION OFFICERS

Foreman in Relationship		Foreman's Degree of Strictness in Applying Rules	Foreman Deviates from Rules	Foreman Concedes to Union	Foreman Co-operates with Union
A	F	Low	+	--	--
	U	Low	+	+	+
B	F	Med.	+	+	+
	U	Med.	--	--	+
C	F	Med.	+	+	+
	U	Med.	+	+	+
D	F	Med.	+	--	+
	U	Med.	+	+	+
E	F	High	+	--	--
	U	Med.	--	+	+
F	F	Med.	+	+	+
	U	Med.	--	+	+
G	F	Med.	+	+	+
	U	Med.	+	+	+
Gx	F	Med.	+	+	+
	U	Med.	+	+	+

F = Foreman's self-report
 U = Union officer's cross-report
 + Positive Response
 -- Negative Response

Table VIII indicates that the most common pattern is that where medium strictness in the application of discipline is exercised by the shop foreman; both sides of the relationship report that the foreman deviates from the rules, makes concessions to the union officer, and the parties work discipline problems out together. Three of the relationships fit this pattern exactly. Another two relationships deviate from the most common pattern in only one side of one of the items. In relationship D the foreman denies that he makes concessions but admits that he deviates from the rules and also that he works things out with his union partner. The union officer in relationship F reports that the foreman does not deviate from the rules but the foreman himself reports that he does. It is reasonable to regard these two relationships as broadly fitting the most common pattern. Thus, only relationships A, B, and E differ to any great extent from the pattern. In relationship A, the foreman reported that he was not very strict and that he did deviate "from the letter of the law." He claimed, however, that he did not make concessions to the union and that he never "worked things out" with the union officer on matters of discipline. The union officer in this relationship reported that the foreman "was not strict enough" and that he "closed his eyes to a lot of things - more than I would." Of even more significance, the union officer reported that the foreman consistently gave employees warnings instead of according them demerit marks. This relationship probably also belongs to the pattern because the foreman's denial

of concession and co-operation can hardly be accepted as genuine. His reaction may have been prompted by his recognition of the fact that he was "too soft" and that even his union partner recognized this. Also, it must be noted that this relationship scored singularly low on the strictness scale. In relationship B the foreman produced a most common pattern response but the items relating to deviation and concession were not confirmed by the union officer. Since the union officer, however, did confirm that they "worked discipline problems out together all the time" deviation must be regarded as being present and concession is implied. On this basis relationship B may also be said to fit broadly into the pattern. The responses of the union officer in this relationship suggested that, perhaps, he was attempting to protect his foreman partner in his responses. Relationship E is the outstanding non-pattern response. Here the foreman admits that he deviates from the rules but denies that he either concedes to the union officer or co-operates with him. This foreman was also the only one who was rated "high" on strictness. The union officer confirmed that the foreman in this relationship was "fairly strict" and that he did not deviate from the rules. However, he also claimed that the foreman did sometimes make concessions and that they sometimes managed to work things out together on matters of discipline. The foreman was very strong in his responses on these points: "If the shop chairman brings up a discipline matter I stick to my guns." Insisting that he did not work things out or co-operate with the union officer the only elaboration he would make on this point was to say:

"I feel I should never start a fight with the union unless I am sure of winning." Relationship E is the only one which stands outside the common pattern of accommodation pertaining to the application of discipline.

If the formal rules relating to the application of discipline were fully applied foremen would have to be rated high on the degree of strictness with which they apply discipline both by their self-reports and by the reports of their union partners. Only the foreman in relationship E reports that he is strict and this is not confirmed by his partner. With strict application of the rules the foremen would report that they do not deviate from the rules, do not make concessions to the union, and do not co-operate on the handling of discipline matters with their union partners. These negative reports would be confirmed by the union officers. The paucity of negative responses in Table VIII indicates strong and general departure from full application of the rules relating to discipline and at the same time provides a measure of accommodation in this area. All the relationships, with one exception, fit into a common pattern which shows that the foremen are only medium on strictness in the application of discipline; they deviate from the rules, make concessions to the union, and co-operate with the union officers in handling disciplinary problems. Accommodation in this area is both considerable and general.

(2) Accommodations on the Application of Seniority

If the application of discipline can be said to be formally a managerial prerogative, then the application of seniority can be said to be formally a union prerogative. Seniority rules have been established as a result of union pressures and demands in past negotiations. Many trade unionists regard such rules as the core of their philosophy and some members regard such rules as the main justification for the union's existence. Seniority rules are the effective norms in a number of situations such as:

- (a) the reduction of staff involving lay-offs;
- (b) the increase of staff involving the recall of men;
- (c) filling vacancies within the shops, involving the transfer of men from one job to another.

The central rule relating to seniority is Rule 39 of the wage agreement:

"Rule 39. Seniority of employees in each craft covered by this Agreement shall be confined to the point at which employed. When it becomes necessary to make a reduction in expenses as provided for in Rule 35, employees in any craft may, under this Rule, exercise their seniority in any position belonging to their craft in their own seniority group provided that the exercise of seniority on a staff comprising both back shop and running work by change from one class of work to the other shall be conditioned upon qualifications for the performance of the work in any individual case."

Two other rules bear upon the seniority provisions:

"Rule 35. . . . When the force is reduced seniority, as per Rule 39, shall govern; the men affected to take the rate of the job to which they are assigned. In the restoration of forces senior men laid off shall be given preference of re-employment. Local Committees shall be furnished with a list of men to be restored to service."

"Rule 37. When reducing forces, if men are needed at any other point they will (if suitable for work required) be given preference to transfer to nearest point, with privilege of returning to home station when force is increased, such transfer to be made without expense to the Company. Seniority to govern in all cases."

The handling of vacancies within a craft in the plant is also governed by the seniority provisions. This is one of the most contentious rules in the agreement from the point of view of the foremen in the shops.

"Rule 25. When new jobs are created or vacancies occur in preference jobs in the respective crafts, senior employees at point at which vacancies occur shall, if sufficient ability is shown by trial, be given preference in filling such new jobs or any vacancies that may be desirable to them. The Local Committee shall be consulted on selection of applicants."

Finally, there is one other rule which relates to the allocation of jobs:

"Rule 31. Employees who have given long and faithful service in the employ of the Company and who have become unable to handle heavy work to advantage will be given preference of such light work in their line as they are able to handle."

There was no evidence of deviation from the formal rules relating to the reduction of staff and the recall of employees on a seniority basis, i.e., Rules 39, 37 and 35. These rules are rigidly enforced by the union officers. Rule 25, relating to men claiming transfer to other jobs, is the area of contention. It is in relation to this rule that deviations and concessions take place.

Any employee who has the necessary amount of seniority may apply for transfer to a job which becomes vacant in his craft or shop. Vacancies are posted on the shop bulletin board and men who would like such jobs make a "bid" or application for the vacancy. Men are liable to bid for jobs for a variety of reasons such as that the vacancy is a better paid job, a cleaner job, a lighter job, or even for personal reasons. Sometimes men bid for jobs for which they are not really qualified because they may have previously specialized in a particular line. According to the rule, the most senior man who makes a bid is entitled to be given a trial at the vacant job.

The foremen regard this as a time-consuming and wasteful practice. They feel that they often have to give trials to men who they believe have no hope of qualifying for the vacant job. The transfer of men involved in this process is also regarded by most of the foremen to be disruptive in that it is constantly breaking up established work gangs. Finally, foremen have the problem of the "perennial bidder," i.e., the employee who is constantly bidding for other jobs and claiming trials for them on the basis of his seniority.

Some of the union officers sympathized with the foremen's viewpoint on this and, as a result, were prepared to deviate from the formal rules and to make concessions to their foremen. Other union officers frustrated their foremen's attempts to deviate from the rules by insisting on the senior man who bids being given a trial for the vacancy.

Table IX represents an attempt to assess the degree of latitude permitted or the amount of accommodation made by union officers on matters related to the seniority rules. It was recognized that this was a rather "tender" area from the union officers' point of view and that they were reluctant to admit deviation from the formal rules which govern seniority. The method of cross-reporting was therefore employed here, i.e., on items (1), (2), and (3) we have reports of the union officers' behaviour and attitude as given by their foremen partners. Item (4) is a self-report by the union officers. The table is based on responses to the following questions:

- (3/23) How do you think this union officer feels about the seniority rules relating to upgrading, transfers, etc.?
- (3/24) Does he ever try to deviate from the agreement on this?
- (3/25) Does he ever make any concessions to you on this?
- (3/26) Do you ever make concessions to the supervisor on this?

TABLE IX

UNION OFFICERS' ACCOMMODATIONS ON THE APPLICATION OF SENIORITY

Union Officer in Relationship	(1) Union Officer's Attitude to Seniority (R e p o r t b y	(2) Union Officer Deviates Foreman)	(3) Union Officer Concedes	(4) Union Officer Concedes (Report by) (Union Officer)
A	+	--	--	X
B	+	+	--	X
C	+	+	X	--
D	+	--	X	--
E	+	+	X	X
F	X	+	+	--
G	+	+	X	+
Gx	+	--	--	X

+ Positive Response
 -- Negative Response
 X Qualified Response

If each union officer strictly enforced the seniority rules and permitted no latitude in their application he would have produced an ideal non-accommodative pattern as follows:

Relationship	(1) Attitude to Seniority	(2) Deviates	(3) Concedes	(4) Concedes
Ideal Non-Accommodative	+	--	--	--

In view of the importance of the seniority rules to the union officers the overall pattern of deviation or accommodation shown in Table IX is significantly large. Not one single case of the ideal non-accommodative pattern emerges from the responses although three of the relationships come close in that they deviate in only one item out of the four. It must be concluded that all union officers permit some latitude in the application of the seniority rules.

If we examine the items separately we find that on item (1), which relates to the reported attitude of the union officers to seniority, all union officers, with one exception, support the seniority rules strongly. On item (4), however, we find that only three of the union officers make an unqualified statement that they do not make concessions to the foremen on seniority questions. One union officer admitted that he makes concessions and the other four gave qualified answers. The qualified responses to the question of whether the union officer made concessions to his foreman were:

- A - "Occasionally, in regards to getting a job out quick."
- B - "We work fifty-fifty, providing it is not breaking the agreement."
- E - "Yes, if it will give a junior man a job and prevent him going out the gate."
- Gx- "Yes, if a man requires a light job."

These are minor deviations and are confined to the allocation of men to jobs within the individual shops.

Items (2), (3), and (4) relate to behaviour as distinct from attitudes. If we take these three items, as a group, they would have produced a total of twenty-four negative responses in a perfect non-accommodative pattern. The number of non-accommodative responses which was actually produced totals nine. Thus, almost two-thirds of these responses represent an element of deviation, concession, or accommodation with respect to the formal rules governing the application of seniority. This, despite the strong supportive attitudes of the union officers to these rules. This must be qualified by emphasis of the fact that the accommodations are confined to those seniority rules which refer to the handling of job vacancies. There is no evidence of accommodation on the more fundamental rules of seniority which relate to the lay-off and recall of employees.

The same method of cross-reporting and a similar set of questions were utilized to obtain information on the attitudes and behaviour of the foremen relating to the application of the seniority rules. The responses to these are shown in Table X.

TABLE X

FOREMEN'S ACCOMMODATIONS ON THE APPLICATION OF SENIORITY

Foreman in Relationship	(1) Foreman's Attitude to Seniority (Report by) (Union)	(2) Foreman Deviates (Report) by (Union)	(3) Foreman Concedes (Report) by (Union)	(4) Foreman Concedes (Report) by (Foreman)
A	X	--	+	X
B	X	--	+	X
C	--	+	--	X
D	+	+	+	--
E	--	+	+	+
F	+	--	+	+
G	--	+	+	X
Gx	--	+	+	+

+ Positive Response
 -- Negative Response
 X Qualified Response

Four of the foremen were reported to be strongly against the seniority rules and consistent with this attitude they were all reported to indulge in attempted deviations from these rules. These deviations were mostly in connection with the filling of vacancies in their shops. Two of the foremen were reported to be in favour of the seniority rules and one of these was reported to attempt to deviate, while the other, acting consistent with his attitude, did not attempt to deviate from the rules. Another two of the foremen were reported upon in a qualified manner regarding

their general attitude to the seniority rules. It was reported of foreman A: "Sometimes he is not too happy because the senior man claims a job which he is not capable of doing." This foreman, however, was reported as not attempting to deviate from the rules. It was reported that foreman B was "very good" on seniority rules "providing the man has the ability to do the job." He, also, was reported as not attempting to deviate.

The foreman in relationship C was the only one reported not to make concessions. Only three other foremen, in relationships E, F, and Gx, gave unqualified confirmation that they made concessions on matters of seniority. The foreman in relationship D denied that he made such concessions and the foremen in relationships A, B, C, and G gave qualified confirmation of such concessions. These qualifications took the following forms:

- A - "Yes, in certain special cases, sympathy cases."
- B - "Yes, in special cases."
- C - "Yes, because the seniority belongs to the union.
On the assignment of certain jobs we will get
into an agreement."
- G - "Yes, to meet compassionate cases."

Here again, the deviations appear to be of a minor nature and are again confined to one aspect of the seniority rules, i.e., as they relate to the allocation of men to jobs and the handling of vacancies within the shops.

The establishment of an ideal non-accommodative pattern for foremen is somewhat more problematical than it was for the

union officers. A suggested pattern is one in which the foreman is reported to have a negative attitude to the seniority rules, reportedly attempts to deviate from the rules, reportedly makes no concessions, and himself reports or confirms that he does not concede. On this basis an ideal non-accommodative pattern would be:

Relationship	(1) Attitude to Seniority	(2) Deviates	(3) Concedes	(4) Concedes
Ideal Non-Accommodative	--	+	--	--

The rationale behind this suggested ideal non-accommodative response pattern for the foremen is that they might be expected to regard the seniority rules as being restrictive and interfering with their goal of achieving optimum production. Further, they might be expected to take the view that the seniority rules are primarily a union prerogative justifying them in attempted deviations wherever this would be to their advantage. In keeping with these general sentiments they might be expected to resist making concessions to the union officers and to deny that such concessions are made. There was not a single case which met the ideal non-accommodative response pattern; the only one which comes close to it is in relationship C where the responses deviated from the ideal non-accommodative pattern in one item.

If we take items (2), (3), and (4) together, as we previously did for the responses for union officers, and thus distinguish the reported "acts" from the reported "attitudes," we find that seventeen of the twenty-four responses do not meet the ideal non-accommodative pattern. Thus, here again, more than two-thirds of the responses indicate deviation and concession. This also is a measure of the incidence of accommodation.

From the strictly formal point of view the foreman, quite apart from his attitude to the seniority rules, would not be expected to deviate, to concede, nor to report or confirm concession. On this basis the degree of deviation totals nineteen out of twenty-four responses on the same three items. This is a further indication of the extent of deviation or accommodation on the application of the seniority rules.

In summary, no cases of correlation with the ideal non-accommodative patterns have been found on either side of the relationships on the question of the application of the seniority rules. In Table XI a comparison is made of the ideal non-accommodative pattern and the actual dominant response pattern. This table is based upon an analysis by single items and is only intended to demonstrate the differences between majority practice and ideal non-accommodative response on an item-by-item basis.

Table XI indicates that the general attitudes of the respondents to seniority comes closest to their ideal patterns. Seven union officers and four foremen are shown to meet the ideal

on this item. The only other category where the responses come near correlation with the ideal is in item (2) where five foremen meet the ideal pattern. The general failure of the dominant response pattern to meet the ideal non-accommodative pattern may be taken as an indication of the extent of accommodation. The accommodations are confined to only one of the three areas of behaviour to which the seniority rules relate.

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF IDEAL NON-ACCOMMODATIVE RESPONSES AND ACTUAL DOMINANT RESPONSES ON SENIORITY BY SEPARATE ITEM

	(1) Attitude to Seniority	(2) Deviates	(3) Concedes	(4) Concedes
<u>Union Officers:</u>				
Ideal Non-Accommodative Response	+	--	--	--
Actual Dominant Response	+	+	X	X
	No. (7)	(5)	(4)	(4)
<u>Foremen:</u>				
Ideal Non-Accommodative Response	--	+	--	--
Actual Dominant Response	--	+	+	X
	No. (4)	(5)	(7)	(4)

(3) Accommodations on the Hiring, Firing, and Lay-off of Men

The phenomenon of men being fired is almost unknown in this plant. To fire a man would be a clear indicator that something was wrong and might set off a chain of events which would threaten the autonomy of the plant and the status of the respondents. One foreman reported that it was more than ten years since anyone had been fired in his department despite the fact that a number of employees had accumulated the maximum number of demerit marks. Another foreman reported: "I have never fired anyone - it is company policy." One foreman recounted the story of an apprentice who had used physical violence on an older employee in his shop and how managerial intervention had prevented effective discipline being applied. The foreman reported: "I wanted to fire this apprentice but 'upstairs' wouldn't let me."

For the most part, few employees ever come near reaching the maximum number of demerit marks as a result of the accommodation process which has been described earlier. When a few of the employees reach the point where they should be automatically fired the plant managers simply ignore the fact. In a few serious cases the plant manager may invoke temporary suspension. This can be maintained as a local matter if the union officers are prepared to accept such a course. Firing a man, however, would involve drawing the attention of head office and a series of such acts would involve head office intervention. This is why firings are almost unknown.

The lay-off of men normally occurs when the plant budget is reduced by the head office. In accordance with this reduction shop foremen are ordered to make a reduction in staff which is usually given in terms of a percentage reduction. Such staff reductions are handled strictly on the basis of seniority rules. In this union officers play a major role. They perform an administrative role for the company in that they maintain up-to-date seniority lists for their shops, and they assist the foremen in the determination of which men, according to seniority, will have to be laid-off. While the company also maintains such records they do this through their employment office with the result that the shop foremen do not have the intimate knowledge of the seniority lists that the union officers have. There is, therefore, a great deal of consultation between the foremen and the union officers both when men are being laid-off and when men are being recalled. The general situation was summed up by one foreman who stated: "I have to consult with the union on lay-offs as it has to go strictly by the seniority lists. The union officers handle a good deal of this." Another reported that "this is all handled through the union."

The union officers play a role in the selection of new employees. If the foreman has been authorized to hire more men he first consults with the shop chairman to ascertain if any men are available for recall. This is in accordance with the agreement. However, when the process of recall has been exhausted most foremen ask the union officer if he can find new men for them.

This latter process is not provided for in the agreement: there is no rule which refers to any agreement with the union relating to procedures for the hiring of new employees. Management retains the exclusive right to set the level of employment but their right to hire anyone they choose has become somewhat modified in practice so that in fact the shop chairmen's nominees are frequently accepted. This may be a natural growth out of the fact that the shop foreman has to consult his union chairman in the first instance to see if any laid-off men are available for recall. Seven of the eight foremen indicated that the union officers obtained new men for them.

There were frequent references to this practice by the respondents in a number of the relationships. One quotation will illustrate this: "If the foreman wants men he tells me and I furnish the men from our local or from an outside local. We call the men and interview them and if I like them I send them to the foreman." To some extent foremen have abdicated their authority in the matter of hiring new men. One foreman said: "If I recommended a man from outside and the union recommended another man - a man who was already a member of their union - the union nominee would have to get the preference." Since there is no rule which stipulates that foremen have to accept union nominees when hiring new men we have here an indication of the extent of union encroachment in this area. This is particularly the case with respect to the skilled trades. It may be that the shop foremen are quite content to accept the service which the union provides

in supplying qualified men as they are required.

The overall picture is that the union officers play an important consultative and administrative role in relation to the lay-off and recall of men and in these areas the seniority rules appear to be strictly enforced. Through some process the union officers have come to dominate the selection of new men being hired. The firing of employees is almost unknown.

(4) Behaviour Related to Areas not Covered by the Formal Agreement

Respondents were asked what their relationship partner tends to do if a problem arises which is not covered by the agreement. Union officers, with the exception of the one in relationship Gx, reported that their foreman consulted with them on such problems and that they usually worked out a mutually satisfactory solution. The shop chairman in relationship Gx, however, reported that the foreman "goes ahead and does what he likes - it is up to us to stop him." With this exception, the general practice is illustrated by the shop chairman who reported: "He (the foreman) calls me in and discusses it with a view to reaching some kind of arrangement."

The foremen reported that the union officers came to them with problems which arose and which were not covered by the agreement. However, they also reported that the union officers tended to consult with each other and that on such matters they would seek advice from the officers of the "Federation."

A supplementary question asked of respondents was whether they found that their relationship partner was prepared to co-operate with them in finding solutions to shop problems which cropped up and which were not covered by the agreement. All foremen reported that their union partners were prepared to co-operate. Union officers reported that their foreman partners were prepared to co-operate, with again the exception of relationship Gx where the union officer reported that the foreman would co-operate "sometimes." When the respondents were asked to specify the kinds of problems which arose in this area they did not give specific replies. Their responses took the form of vague generalities such as "various," "small things," and "general."

On the assumption that some of these problems might be of a recurring nature an attempt was made to ascertain whether "informal arrangements" were ever worked out by the parties in the relationships at the shop level. The following question was put to the respondents:

(4/8) Have you ever been able to work out informal arrangements with the shop foreman/union officer to deal with problems you have had in the shop?

All foremen produced a positive response; six of the union officers also produced a positive response; the union officers in relationships F and Gx produced negative responses.

Arrangements were reached covering a variety of situations. The undernoted were the most frequently mentioned:

- (a) the placing of sick men in light jobs;
- (b) changing men's shifts due to sickness in the family or to facilitate special personal arrangements;
- (c) assignment of men to jobs outside their own shop;
- (d) physical arrangements in the shop; and
- (e) overtime arrangements.

These were relatively small problems and they were confined to individual shops. As one foreman put it: "We try to keep our problems in our own shop. We are not always running to management. If it goes further than the shop it becomes 'front page' so we keep it in the shop and find a way around it - so long as nobody is getting hurt." In relationship F the union officer said that he felt that he could not make informal arrangements: "We must have everything in writing most of the time. We don't do anything verbal anymore." The foreman in this relationship reported that they had made informal arrangements on men working through the lunch hour and on transferring men. The union officer in relationship Gx said that he did not make informal arrangements and stated: "We are not too much in favour of that. If you give them an inch - they will take a foot." The foreman in this relationship, however, reported that they had made informal arrangements dealing with the distribution of overtime and the changing of men's work.

Respondents, with the exception of the union officer in relationship F, felt that they should have the power to conclude

local arrangements. All foremen and four of the union officers stated that they already had this power. The general sentiment on both sides was that they should be able to make local arrangements on matters which are confined to the individual shops and which fall outside the wage agreement. All respondents, with the exception of both parties in relationship D, reported that if problems did arise which were outside the agreement they usually managed to solve them by working something out together at the shop level. All respondents, with the exception of the union officer in relationship A, reported that they had been able to make local arrangements which were beneficial to both parties. The union officer in relationship A reported that the need for such arrangements did not arise in his shop.

Accommodations are made in each of the four areas dealt with in this chapter. None of the foremen fully enforces the rules on discipline and this constitutes an accommodation which is made to their union partners. It is also found that none of the union officers fully enforces the seniority rules. In their fundamental aspects, where they bear upon the lay-off and recall of men, the seniority rules are enforced but accommodations are made to the foremen in the transfer of men and the filling of vacancies. The firing of men is a rare occurrence and lay-offs take place on the basis of the seniority rules. However, the supervisory prerogative in the hiring of men has, in practice, been largely taken over by the union officers who nominate new men for vacancies. When problems arise in the shops which are

not covered by the formal agreement the parties to the key relationships consult with each other and co-operate on finding mutually satisfactory solutions. Where a problem is of a recurring nature "informal arrangements" tend to be reached which will govern such situations.

CHAPTER V

TWO CASE STUDIES - THE TWO EXTREMES

In this chapter an attempt will be made to characterize some of the major aspects of the two cases which fall at the extreme points of a "harmonious-contentious" continuum. All of the relationships have a great deal in common. All utilize the processes of accommodation, deviation, concession, and treaty-making but they vary in terms of degree and there is a significant variation in the general attitudes surrounding these processes. It is for this reason that the technique of reporting on the two extreme cases has been employed. These are not deviant cases but they do represent the extremes of attitude and harmonious content within which the common processes of accommodation take place. A general description of the two cases will be followed by a comparison of some of the main characteristics in the relationships and their importance.

1. Relationship A - The Most Harmonious Relationship

Grievances: Relationship A may be regarded as the most harmonious relationship. It provides the only one where neither of the parties found it necessary to progress a grievance higher than the relationship level in the year preceding the study. Nor was any reference made by either of the parties to the use of coercion by the union officer threatening to break the informal

norm of non-referral in order to win concessions from the foreman. Both respondents gave unqualified positive responses in assessing their partner's co-operativeness. The foreman had a positive general attitude toward dealing with union officers and this was confirmed by his union partner. The foreman also reported that he sought advice on problems from his union partner and this was confirmed.

Discipline: The foreman was ranked "low" on strictness on the application of discipline and this was confirmed. The union officer reported that the foreman deviated from the rules on the application of discipline and this was admitted by the foreman. The union officer reported that his partner made concessions to him and co-operated with him on discipline matters but this was denied by the foreman. Examples cited by the union officer suggest that his report of concessions and co-operation is correct but that the foreman did not want to admit it.

Seniority: The union officer was reported to have very strong views about supporting the seniority rules. He was reported not to deviate nor make concessions in regard to them. However, the union officer admitted that he occasionally made concessions to the foreman on these rules in special circumstances. The union shop chairman came close to the ideal non-accommodative pattern as he deviated in only one item out of four. The foreman deviated from the ideal non-accommodative pattern on all four items. Thus, we have here a strong non-accommodative attitude on the part of the union officer and a strong accommodative

attitude on the part of the foreman. The foreman's support for the seniority rules guaranteed harmony on this question. He was reported as not attempting to deviate from the rules although he would make concessions to his union partner on the location of men. He admitted that he made concessions to the union in special sympathy cases.

Reciprocal Attitudes: Both partners described their relationship as "excellent." The union officer expressed the view that his partner was both a good man for the company and a good supervisor. The former: "for the simple reason that he tries to get the best from the men without 'whipping' them;" and the latter because he co-operated. The foreman felt that the union officer was a good man for the company because he co-operated and "is willing to be reasonable so long as it doesn't break the agreement - he is prepared to bend it." He felt that his partner was a good union officer because he obtained more from higher management because of his flexibility. The foreman, however, felt that the unions in the plant had a bit too much strength and that there was hardly a move that he could make without consulting them. The union officer reported that his partner sometimes claimed that the unions had too much strength but he always retracted such statements later. Despite his views on the strength of the unions, the foreman felt that he had enough power to do his job well. The union officer felt that the foreman made concessions to prevent complications and to stop things being referred higher.

The foreman felt that the union officer made concessions "because I go halfway with him on other things." He said that the essence of their relationship was that they worked together.

Contextual Factors:

- (a) Size: This relationship is located in and concerned with the smallest shop in the plant: seventy-three men make up the entire unit. The foreman and the union officer work at adjacent desks in the shop general office and are in continuous contact with each other. There are no physical or organizational barriers to the initiation of interaction by either of them.
- (b) Skill: The employees in this shop had, as a group, a relatively high skill content. It was estimated that one-third of the men were highly skilled, one-third were semi-skilled, and the remaining one-third were unskilled.
- (c) Ethnicity: The work force was equally divided among English-Canadians and French-Canadians. Foreman and union officer shared a common ethnic origin of Scottish birth and emigration to Canada at an early age.
- (d) Respondent Characteristics: The union officer, with forty-eight years of service with the company, had

longer service than any other respondent.

The foreman, with forty-two years of service, also came near the top of the long service list.

Both had equal industrial history and craft status. Both started work in the Angus Shops as apprentices, served their apprenticeships successfully and became craftsmen. Neither of them has ever worked elsewhere.

The union officer was the only one of his group who had ever held a supervisory job with the company. He has held his present union post for five years, was not opposed in the last election, and intends to run for re-election.

The foreman has been the foreman in this shop for the last seventeen years and has worked alongside his union partner throughout his working life. He has never held office in the union although he has always been a union member.

Conceptions of Role Relationship: The union officer felt that his main task was to try to keep harmonious relations. He regarded this as his most essential task. The foreman felt that his partner's main task was to watch out for the welfare of the men; to see that the wage agreement was lived up to, but having due regard for the interests of the company. The foreman felt that his main task was concerned with production and getting things out on schedule. To this end he was concerned with "having

a happy family because a happy gang is a good gang." The union officer felt that his partner's main task was to get the production out with the least possible conflict.

Assessment of Utility of Union Function: The union officer felt that he performed a useful function for the company by maintaining good relations and solving problems. He stated: "We do the company a lot of good. We save them a lot of headaches by dealing with the imaginary grievances of the men." The foreman felt that the union officer performed a useful function for the company.

2. Relationship Gx - The Least Harmonious Relationship

Grievances: Relationship Gx may be regarded as the least harmonious or the most contentious relationship. Here, the union officer found it necessary to progress twenty-four grievances higher than the relationship in the preceding year; the foreman referred two grievances higher. The foreman reported that his partner attempted to coerce him into making concessions by threatening upward referral. Both respondents gave negative responses in assessing their partner's co-operativeness. The foreman had a negative general attitude toward dealing with union officers and this was confirmed by his union partner. The union officer claimed that the foreman would like to have a free hand in running the shop. The foreman stated that he "did not get along at all" with his partner. He said that he sometimes settled things with his partner to prevent them from going "upstairs" but

that he was always ready to put up a fight whether he had a chance of winning or not. The foreman reported that he did not seek advice on problems from his union partner and this was confirmed. The foreman reported that he adopted a negative attitude when grievances were raised and stated: "I enjoy it when the union are (sic) in the wrong."

Discipline: The foreman was ranked "medium" on strictness on the application of discipline and this was confirmed. The foreman reported that he deviated from the rules, made concessions, and sometimes co-operated with his union partner on disciplinary matters and this was confirmed. The foreman outlined his position on discipline in the following terms:

"I try to be strict, but I get discouraged. I don't get backed up higher up if I enforce discipline. So, I deviate from the rules - I don't go looking for trouble - I avoid catching men out. But, when I do catch them I don't let them go. When I send things upstairs I am not backed up. I sometimes make concessions to the union - if a case is not too bad I would reduce the demerit marks. We sometimes manage to work things out if a case is not too serious."

This general position, which was confirmed by the union partner, illustrates the dilemma of the foreman who attempts to operate on the basis of the formal rules rather than through the accommodation process. If he applies the formal rules he transgresses the informal norm of non-referral and is denied support from the plant management as well as damaging his status.

Seniority: The union officer was reported to have very strong positive views on the seniority rules and neither to deviate nor to concede in relation to them. He said that he would concede to locate a disabled or sick man in a light job for which the man did not have sufficient seniority. The union officer came close to the ideal non-accommodative pattern as he deviated on only one item out of four. The foreman deviated from the ideal non-accommodative pattern on two items out of four. His general attitude to the seniority rules was negative and he was reported to be constantly attempting to deviate from the rules. The union officer claimed that the foreman attempted to break the rules all the time and that he had to be on guard to enforce them. We find here a strong non-accommodative attitude on the part of the union officer and an almost equally strong non-accommodative attitude on the part of the shop foreman.

Reciprocal Attitudes: Both partners rated the status of their relationship as only "fair." The union officer expressed the view that his partner was a good man for the company but only in the sense that he was a "company man." He also thought his partner might be regarded as a good supervisor from the point of view that he knew the work of the shop well. The foreman felt that the union officer was not a good man for the company because he was "only a glorified labourer who thought only of himself and union politics." He felt that his partner could not be described as a good union officer. The foreman felt that the unions in the plant had too much strength. He said that it was difficult for

him to talk about the unions without becoming emotional. He complained that they "butted" into a lot of things that were none of their business and that they tried to take over the running of his shop. He felt that he had enough power to do his job well despite the strength of the unions. The union officer felt that the foreman only made concessions to him when they would assist production as production was his sole concern. The foreman felt that the union officer made concessions to him because he had been prepared to fight and beat the union officer in the past.

Contextual Factors:

- (a) Size: This relationship is located in and concerned with the largest shop in the plant: sixteen hundred men make up the unit. Foreman and union officer are normally located at a distance of ten minutes walk from each other. Contact only takes place when problems arise. To initiate interaction the foreman must summon the union officer to his office or the union officer must call the office of the foreman and request a meeting with him.
- (b) Skill: The union officer and the foreman disagreed concerning the skill content of the shop workforce. The union officer's estimate was twenty per cent highly skilled, forty per cent semi-skilled, and forty per cent unskilled. The foreman's estimate, which downgraded the skill content, was five per cent

highly skilled, sixty per cent semi-skilled, and thirty-five per cent unskilled.

(c) Ethnicity: The work force was made up of approximately eighty per cent French-Canadians, ten per cent Italians, seven per cent English-Canadians, and three per cent who were described as assorted Europeans. The foreman and union officer were French-Canadian in origin and culture and French was the language they used in talking to each other.

(d) Respondent Characteristics: The union officer had the lowest service of all the respondents, having only twenty-three years of service with the company. The foreman came near the top of the list with forty-six years of service.

The partners had dissimilar industrial histories and craft status. The foreman started working in the Angus Shops as an apprentice, served his apprenticeship successfully and became a craftsman. He has spent all of his working life in these shops. The union officer came to the Angus Shops as a labourer after having worked in a variety of other jobs outside. After working as a labourer for a number of years he was promoted to the category of helper. Some years later he was promoted to the

craftsman classification. In the parlance of the shops he would be regarded as low in occupational status because he is not a "time served man."

The union officer has held his present union post for five years, was opposed in the last election, and intends to run for re-election.

The foreman has been the foreman of the shop for seventeen years. He said that he was a member of the union at one time but that he quit the union when he became a supervisor.

Conceptions of Role Relationship: The union officer felt that his main task was the protection of the employees within the wage agreement. The foreman felt that his partner's main task was in the location and placing of men. The foreman felt that his own main task was in applying discipline. He stated that he was concerned with costing and planning but felt that the maintenance of discipline was the primary and most difficult feature of his duties. The union officer felt that the foreman's main task was in getting production.

Assessment of Utility of Union Function: The union officer felt that he performed a useful function for the company by doing a lot of the company's clerical work such as the revision of seniority rosters. He claimed that in the absence of union officers the supervisors would be lost. The foreman felt that

the union officer performed no useful function for the company. He described the union officers as a "bunch of 'lemons' seeking white collar jobs."

3. Contrasting Aspects of the Two Extreme Cases

The observations being made in this section, on the basis of a comparison of certain features of the two extreme cases, can only be regarded as a tentative exploration in pursuit of the formulation of further hypotheses. Since the two cases represent the extreme points of a "harmonious-non-harmonious" continuum it seems worthwhile summarizing those aspects of the two relationships which show contrasting situations.

TABLE XII
CONTRASTING ASPECTS OF THE TWO EXTREME RELATIONSHIPS

Aspect	Harmonious	Non-Harmonious
Size of shop	Small (73 men)	Large (1,600 men)
Skill Content	33% High 33% Semi-skilled 33% Unskilled	5% High 60% Semi-skilled 35% Unskilled
Physical Location of Partners	Close	Distant
Frequency and Nature of Interaction	Constant-General	Intermittent-Problem-Related
Ethnic Distribution of the Workforce	50% French-Canadian 50% English-Canadian	80% French-Canadian 10% Italian 7% English-Canadian 3% European
<u>Characteristics of Relationship Partners:</u>		
Ethnic Origin	Common-Scottish	Common-French-Canadian
Length of Service	Union - 48 years Foreman - 42 years	Union - 23 years Foreman - 46 years
Industrial History	Similar	Dissimilar
Craft Status	Equal	Unequal
Union Status	Not Opposed in Last Election	Opposed in Last Election

The first five aspects, outlined in the table, are contextual factors which are related to the structure of the two shops. The other five aspects are related to the personal histories of the relationship partners but they have possible consequences for the relationships. The most harmonious relationship is located in the smallest shop in the plant comprising only seventy-three men. The least harmonious relationship is located in the largest shop in the plant and is comprised of sixteen hundred men. In some respects, the foreman in shop A is in a position analagous to the owner of a small independent shop. Lipset, Trow, and Coleman have studied the influence of shop size in their study of the printing industry and while they were comparing separate units some of their observations are relevant:

"In many small print shops the owner himself is a union member, and in the smallest shops he may even work at the trade in the old craft tradition of the master surrounded by his journeymen. In contrast, the printer in the large shop is one worker among many; his employer is the firm rather than John Jones; his foreman is a full-time work supervisor, who, though a member of the union, is more likely to be perceived as a representative of management than as a fellow worker."¹¹

The foreman in relationship A acts rather like the owner of a small contracting shop which is supplying parts to the plant. His unit is small and homogeneous, he is well acquainted with all

11. S. M. Lipset, M. Trow, and J. Coleman, Industrial Democracy, (New York: Doubleday and Company, Anchor Books, 1962), pp. 172-3.

of the members of his unit, and frequently interacts with them. He does not actually work with his men as does the owner of the small print shop but it was observed that he spends a great deal of time on the shop floor discussing their work with them. We have noted earlier that this foreman referred to his unit of seventy-three men as his "gang;" it suggests that the group in this shop is homogeneous and that the foreman has an intimate relationship with the members. This will have implications for the union officer-shop foreman relationship in that problems relating to the men are regarded in the light of the individuals concerned and not in the light of problems of anonymous employees. We suspect that the foreman is not regarded by the men in the shop as part of management so much as the leader of their group. He is closely related to work activities and goals of the group.

From the point of view of the men in his shop the foreman in the least harmonious relationship is in the position of the distant representative of management. He knows few of the men who are members of his large unit of sixteen hundred; he cannot interact with them. He is far removed from the work activities of the men as he is required to spend most of his time on administrative work in his office. He deals with the assistant foremen in his office and they deal with the men on the shop floor. In this respect he has much less chance of coping with problems in the shops in their early stages than the foreman in relationship A. The men who work in shop Gx are anonymous employees rather than individuals from the foreman's point of view.

The factor of size is related to two other factors: locational proximity and the nature of interaction. In the most harmonious relationship the partners work at adjacent desks and the nature of their interaction is informal and general. They constantly exchange opinions on all kinds of things both related to work and not so related. In the least harmonious relationship interaction is intermittent and is exclusively problem-related, i.e., the partners interact only when they have problems to deal with. Thus, their interaction is formal and specific. This is associated with the physical separation of the parties in their normal locations.

It is difficult to assess the relative importance of the contextual factor of skill content of the shop workforce. The most harmonious relationship had a much higher proportion of highly skilled men than the least harmonious one. Significantly, the partners in relationship A were in agreement on the skill content of their workforce whereas the foreman in relationship Gx had a much lower estimate of the skill content of his workforce than his union partner. The foreman in relationship A had high regard for the competence and skill of his men; the foreman in relationship Gx had a low regard for the men in his shop and claimed that more than half of them were incompetent and should be thrown out. We suspect that the reason for this contrast in attitudes is that shop A has a much higher proportion of "time-served" men than shop Gx. "Time-served" men are men who have served a regular apprentice at their trade. In shop Gx many of

the men started work in the shop as labourers, improved to be helpers, and later improved to tradesman status. Such men have a lower craft status throughout the shops than "time-served" men.

The available data do not show the significance of the differing ethnic distribution of the workforces in the two shops. The policy of the company for many years was to hire young journeymen in the United Kingdom. While this policy no longer exists its impact on ethnic distribution and skill in the shops persists. The majority of the highly skilled men in all the shops are English-Canadians, many of whom emigrated from the United Kingdom to come and work here. It will be noted that the proportion of English-Canadians is very small in the non-harmonious shop and that the high skill content is also small. An interesting question here would be whether the shops provide correlations between ethnicity and skill but the data presently available do not justify making conclusions on this point. All that can be said is that the shop with the relatively high skill content also has a relatively high English-Canadian ethnic character and vice versa.

The partners in each relationship share a common ethnic origin; the most harmonious being Scottish, and the least harmonious being French-Canadian. This is probably not of such great importance as a factor like shop size but it may have an influence on general attitudes which are brought to the relationships. The two partners in relationship A are members of an immigrant group and may tend to maintain their solidarity in

in relation to the majority; they may be expected to be well-disposed toward one another and this may have some effect on the relationship.

There are a group of factors related to the personal histories of the respondents which have significance for the general status and prestige which they bring to their relationships. In relationship A, the two partners have fairly equal records of service; similar industrial history, having both worked in the Angus Shops all their lives; and equal craft status since both are "time-served" men. These provide the partners with a foundation of equal status and prestige. The major difference in their statuses is derived from their respective roles. The foreman supervises a small, highly skilled workforce so that he is probably relatively low in the supervisors' status hierarchy. While the union officer represents this small group he is at the top of the union officers' status hierarchy as he is the senior officer in the local union Federation. Despite the difference of the partners' status location in their own groups, the equal craft status which they enjoy may be regarded as tending to induce an attitude of mutual respect and co-operation. In the least harmonious relationship the foreman has no respect for his union partner. The status positions of the partners are very unequal. The foreman has long service, has worked all his life in the plant, and is a "time-served" man. The union officer has relatively short service, has worked outside before coming to Angus Shops, and although he has achieved the tradesman classifi-

cation, he is not a "time-served" man. This means that the union officer enters the relationship low in prestige. This being so, he may be inclined to balance it by exerting the authority of his union role strongly and this, of course, would lead to disharmony.

It is also felt that the status of the union officer within his own union group may have consequences for the relationship. The union officer in relationship A enjoyed high prestige in his group and had not been opposed in the last union election. The converse was true for the union officer in relationship Gx. He had been opposed in his last election and was concerned about his re-election. The union officer role in this plant is, in practice, a full-time job - although this is not supposed to be the case. The concept of union work as a "job" is important in this plant. The union officers do no "productive" work and yet they are paid at their regular rates by the company. Their time is devoted to handling union and union-management affairs. By tacit agreement, the union officers enter job No. 2931 on their time cards. This job number signifies that they are engaged in union work. Most union officers have the use of desks within the regular offices of the plant and some have "unofficial" offices of their own. The union officer roles provide their occupants with a large measure of freedom and have to be regarded as premium "jobs." Most of the incumbents were anxious to ensure their re-election. The fact that the union officer in relationship Gx was opposed in his previous election may have made him over-anxious to please his members. This would lead him to take

up grievances that a more secure union officer would reject.

It is difficult to assess the relative importance of the various factors in terms of their effects upon the relationships. The two relationships examined here are similar only on the factor of common ethnicity so that any of the other factors could be equally important in influencing the character of the relationships. There is a need for further research to determine the relative importance of the factors which have been identified. On a wider scale, groups of harmonious and non-harmonious relationships might be analysed to determine the relative importance of each of the factors.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

This study has been primarily concerned with investigating the hypothesis that the structure within which the union-management accommodation process occurs has a significant effect on the quality of the relationship and its results. It involved consideration of the degree to which the type of relationship is determined by the bargaining structure. The specific question posed was: "What difference does it make to the local establishment if the basic standards are formulated outside of the establishment by outside management and union representatives?" The first major difference is that the content of the local union-management relationship is affected. The local parties to the relationship are formally excluded from determination of the basic features of their contract relationship. The national type of contract does not take many features of the individual local plant into account and the parties at this level are forced to attempt to meet local problems through the processes of contract interpretation and administration. The formulation of basic standards by outside parties has the general effect of largely reducing antagonism at the local establishment level. The local people on both sides have a generally high co-operative content in their relationships. They recognize that they are both operating on the basis of a "foreign" document which

sets out the formal rules of their relationship. Their areas of self-determination are confined to the processes of contract interpretation and administration and the informal processes of accommodation in their day-to-day relationships.

In the plant studied, the external structure of outside contract determination was associated with a high level of autonomy of the parties at the local plant level in matters of plant operation and contract administration. This autonomy could be successfully maintained so long as union-management problems were handled at the local level and did not have to be referred above the plant level by either of the parties. Autonomy permitted the operation of an informal process of accommodation which met the needs of both parties, needs that could not be successfully met within the formal rules. In order to maintain a high degree of autonomy in the operation of the plant the plant managers had to maintain a high occupational status which, in part, depended upon union-management problems being successfully coped with at the plant level. This was passed down the managerial hierarchy to the superintendent level and was expressed through the shop foremen's desire to contain and solve problems at the shop level.

The study shows that out of this structural condition there has been the development of an informal norm of non-referral which requires that union-management problems be contained and solved at the lowest possible level of relationship. This norm operates most often at the level of the individual shop but it is

at its strongest at the plant level where it is almost always observed by both union and management representatives. Failure to maintain the informal norm of non-referral at the plant level would produce negative sanctions for both parties by threatening their autonomy and their respective statuses. At the level of the individual shop, failure to maintain the norm threatens the relative autonomy of the shop foreman and his occupational status. The norm is maintained at the shop level due to the fact that the union officer or shop chairman also has objectives which cannot be met by strict application of the formal rules. The union officer wants to obtain concessions from the foreman, outside the formal rules, to pass on to his members, to maintain his status, and to ensure his re-election to a privileged role which he values.

Out of these conditions there has developed a process of informal accommodation and treaty-making which operates in the union-management relationship at the shop level. This process is surrounded by a varying degree of co-operative sentiments. Some non-co-operative sentiments exist between the parties; these vary from relationship to relationship and from issue to issue. Generally, these are not dysfunctional to the operation of the relationships as their manifestation tends to lead to a breakdown in the informal processes of accommodation and a failure to meet the respective needs of the parties with a consequent status reduction and threat to the autonomy of the parties. The union officer is in a position of advantage as he can utilize a threat of upward referral to coerce the shop foreman to make concessions.

This advantage only disappears at the plant level where a failure to resolve problems will threaten the autonomy and status of both parties.

This study raises a number of questions which require further research. A number of factors have been identified which have consequences for the status of the union-management relationship and while these have been examined in some detail with reference to the two extreme cases they require more general study both in this plant and in others.

It was noted that this plant has a number of inbuilt stability factors in terms of union-management relations such as its non-competitive character, and certain characteristics of its workforce. There is a need for further research to compare the union-management relationship in this plant with others which share the factor of outside contract settlement but which do not exhibit the same inbuilt stability factors.

In a study of this kind one can never be certain that the situation under observation does not constitute a special case. Bargaining at a level higher than the individual plant implies that there is some physical separation between head office and individual plant. The combination of these two factors may always lead to the structural and relational developments which have been observed at the Angus Shops. This can only be confirmed by further research and comparison.

APPENDICES

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Seventeen respondents comprise the occupants of the key roles of union shop chairmen and shop foremen. These provide eight relationships which are referred to throughout the study as relationships A, B, C, D, E, F, Fx, G, and Gx. The category Fx is not a proper relationship. It arises from the fact that one of the General Shop Foremen was the relationship partner of two union shop chairmen. Since the foreman only made cross reports on the union officer with whom he had the most dealings the Fx relationship constitutes a supplementary report on one General Foreman. There is no reciprocity in the Fx reports and this category cannot be regarded as a complete relationship. The reason for reporting two of the relationships as G and Gx is that this is a case where one union maintains a relationship with two foremen. However, two separate shops are involved and two different officers from the same union so these do constitute full relationships. We have eight full relationships in the study, i.e., all relationships with the exception of Fx.

Most of the union shop chairmen have a record of long service in this plant ranging from a low of seventeen years to a high of forty-eight years. The foremen's service ranges from

thirty-four years to forty-six years; the only exception being one foreman who has worked most of the time at another plant belonging to the same company. Four of the union shop chairmen started work in this plant as boys. Two of them started work as "shop boys" or messengers and later became apprentices; the other two started work in this plant as apprentices to their respective crafts. Three of the union shop chairmen started work in the Angus Shops as labourers; two of these progressed to achieve craftsman status and the third is still a labourer. The remaining two union shop chairmen served their apprenticeships with other companies and later came to work at this plant.

Of the eight foremen in the sample, six started work in the Angus Shops as apprentices, the other two started work as "shop boys" and later became apprentices. Seven of the foremen have spent their working lives in this plant and the other has spent his working life with the C.P.R. but only nine years in these particular shops. Only four of the seventeen respondents in the sample have ever worked anywhere other than the Angus Shops; the remaining thirteen respondents started work in this plant straight from school, served their apprenticeships here, and have continued to work here.

At the time that the study was conducted it was estimated that approximately four thousand men were employed in the plant, excluding the office employees. It was also estimated that approximately 75% of the employees were French-Canadians, the remainder being mostly English-Canadians although there were a

number of workers of Italian and central European origin in some of the shops. The reported ethnic origin of the respondents and the language used in interaction produced the following responses:

TABLE XIII
REPORTED ETHNIC ORIGIN AND LANGUAGE
USED IN RELATIONSHIP INTERACTION

Relationship	Reported Ethnic Origin:		Language Used:	
	Union	Foreman	Union	Foreman
A	Scottish	Scottish	English	English
B	English-Can.	English-Can.	English	English
C	French-Can.	French-Can.	Eng. & Fr.	Mostly French
D	French-Can.	English-Can.	English	English
E	English-Can.	English-Can.	English	English
F	French-Can	Scottish	English	English
Fx	French-Can.		English	
G	French-Can.	English-Can.	English	Eng. & Fr.
Gx	French-Can.	French-Can.	French	French

This shows that of the nine union officers in the sample, six are French-Canadians and three may be described as English-Canadians. Of the eight foremen in the sample, only two are French-Canadians while the other six may be described as English-Canadians. Of the eight key relationships, five are occupied on both sides by people of common ethnic origin, three of these being English-Canadian and two being French-Canadian. The remaining three key

relationships are occupied on one side by an English-Canadian and on the other by a French-Canadian.

Despite the fact that eight of the seventeen respondents occupying roles in the key relationships are French-Canadians the operational language in the plant is reported to be almost exclusively English. Only two out of the eight foremen are French-Canadians and none of the higher management officers in the plant are French-Canadian. Despite the fact that English is nearly always used in interaction in the union-management relationships, ten of the seventeen respondents in these relationships claimed to be bilingual; five claimed to be partially bilingual; two said that they spoke English only. Of the nine union shop chairmen, seven claimed to be bilingual and one to be partially bilingual. Three foremen claimed to be bilingual and another four claimed to be partially bilingual. Of the ten respondents who claimed that they were bilingual, seven were French-Canadians; four of these were union officers and three were foremen. Only one union officer reported that he was not bilingual. Of the remaining five English-Canadian foremen, four claimed to be partially bilingual and the other reported that he was not bilingual

SCHEDULE B-1

Interview Schedule for Supervisors

Area of Jurisdiction, Industrial History, Union Affiliation,
and Ethnic Factors.

- 1/2. What departments do you have jurisdiction in?
- 1/3. What is your own occupational classification?
- 1/4. How long have you worked for the C.P.R.?
- 1/5. How long have you worked in the Angus Shops?
- 1/6. What was the first job that you had with the C.P.R.?
- 1/7. What was the first job that you had in the Angus Shops?
- 1/9. How long have you held your present job?
- 1/16. Have you ever been a member of a trade union?
- 1/16a. Have you ever held office in a trade union?
- 1/17. What is your ethnic origin?
- 1/18. Are you bilingual?

Relationship Partners.

- 2/1. In your official capacity, as a foreman, how many union officers do you have regular dealings with? (Indicate union officer and how often.)
- 2/2. Which union officers do you have the most frequent dealings with?

Cross-report on relationship partner's attitudes and actions.

- 3/1. Describe the position held by the union officer with whom you have the most frequent official dealings.
- 3/2. On the average, how often do you have dealings with this officer?
- 3/3. What is his ethnic origin?
- 3/4. What language do you speak at your meetings?
- 3/5. Do you consider that he knows the contract agreement well?
- 3/6. Do you find him co-operative?
- 3/8. How do you feel about having to deal with union officers?
- 3/9. Do you ever seek advice on your problems from the union officer (s)?
- 3/10. What do you feel when you are told that the union officer(s) want to see you on another grievance?
- 3/11. What percentage of the grievances that come before you are you able to settle right here?
- 3/12. Do you find the union officer(s) anxious to prevent grievances from going higher up the line?
- 3/13. Have you ever found the union officer willing to concede a point to you to get a problem settled at the shop level?
- 3/14. What kinds of things would the union officer be prepared to concede on?
- 3/15. Are there any issues that you find the union officer very rigid and inflexible on?
- 3/16. Why do you think that this union officer does/does not make concessions to you?
- 3/17. How do you feel about the strength that the unions have?
- 3/18. Do you feel that you have enough power to do your job well?
- 3/19. Would you describe your relationship with this union officer as excellent, very good, good, fair, bad, or very bad? Why?
- 3/20. Do you think that this union officer is a good man for the company? Why?

- 3/21. Do you think that he is a good union officer? Why?
- 3/22. If a problem arises which is not covered by the agreement what does this union officer tend to do?

Seniority.

- 3/23.. How do you think this union officer feels about the seniority rules relating to upgrading, transfers, etc.?
- 3/24. Does he ever try to deviate from the agreement on this?
- 3/25. Does he ever make any concessions to you on this?
- 3/26. Do you ever make any concessions to him on this?
- 3/27. What happens if problems arise relating to seniority which are not covered in the master agreement?
- 3/28. Have you ever had problems in the shop which required that you find local solutions on questions related to seniority?

Discipline.

- 3/29. How strict are you on the application of discipline?
- 3/30. Do you ever deviate from the "letter of the law" on this?
- 3/31. Do you ever make concessions to the union on this? Why?
- 3/32. Do you sometimes manage to work things out together on this?

Hiring, Firing, and Lay-offs.

- 3/33. What role do you play in the hiring, firing, and laying-off of men?
- 3/34. Do you ever accept suggestions in this area from the union?
- 3/35. Do you ever make concessions on these things to the union to meet local conditions?

Partner's General Attitude.

- 3/36. In general, is the union officer a man who sticks rigidly to the letter of the agreement or someone who is prepared to work out local problems with you? (Obtain examples.)
- 3/37. Why do you think the union officer takes this attitude?

Problems outside the Agreement and Informal Arrangements.

- 4/1. Do problems sometimes arise in the shop which are not covered in your wage agreement? What kinds of things?
- 4/2. How do you usually cope with situations which arise which are not specifically covered?
- 4/3. Are there any rules in the agreement presently which create difficulties for you as a supervisor?
- 4/4. Are there any provisions not in the agreement at the moment which you would like to see there? (Specify and give reasons why.)
- 4/5. How does the union officer react to problems which arise which are not covered in the agreement?
- 4/6. How do you react?
- 4/7. Do you and the union officer usually manage to work out such problems without taking it higher?
- 4/8. Have you ever been able to work out informal arrangements with the union officer to deal with problems you have had in the shop?
- 4/9. Do you think that as a local supervisor you should have some power to make local arrangements to cover particular problems in your shop?
- 4/10. In which areas?
- 4/11. Have you ever been able to make a local arrangement which was beneficial to both parties?
- 4/12. Do you find that the union officer is prepared to co-operate with you to find a solution to a shop problem which has cropped up and which is not covered in the agreement?
- 4/13. On what kinds of problems?

The Incidence and Nature of Grievances.

- 5/6. How many grievances are normally brought to you in the average month?
- 5/7. What percentage of these do you manage to settle yourself?
- 5/8. What kinds of things can you normally reach agreement on?
- 5/9. What kinds of things can you not normally reach agreement on?
- 5/10. In general, what is the most recurring source of grievance?
- 5/11. What other things are the source of regular grievances?
- 5/12. Why do you think these things cause conflict?
- 5/13. Are you ever able to work out local arrangements to solve some of these problems? What kinds of things and at what level?
- 5/14. Are you ever able to solve problems outside the formal grievance process? What kinds of things and under what procedure?
- 5/15. What kinds of issues do you find lend themselves to settlement through informal arrangements?
- 5/16. What kinds of issues do you find do not lend themselves to settlement through informal arrangements?
- 5/17. What problems do you have the most disagreement with the union officers on? Why?
- 5/18. What problems do you find the easiest to settle? Why?
- 5/19. Do you feel that the formal grievance procedure is adequate to cope with all the problems that you have arising in your shop?

Local v. National Contract.

- 6/1. Do you ever feel that you are at some disadvantage in having a national rather than a local contract?

- 6/2. Do you ever feel that the local union officers are at some disadvantage in having a national rather than a local contract?
- 6/3. What advantages or disadvantages do you think a local contract might have from management's point of view?
- 6/4. What advantages or disadvantages do you think a local contract might have from the union point of view?
- 6/5. How closely do you follow the national negotiations?
- 6/6. How closely do you think the average employee follows them?
- 6/7. Do you think that the national negotiators are able to take your local problems into account?

Retaining Grievances at the local level.

- 7/3. How many grievances would you normally have passed up higher in a year?
- 7/4. What kinds of issues would be involved?
- 7/10. Do you feel that union and management should co-operate to settle all issues at the local level? Why?
- 7/11. Would you ever be prepared to compromise or make concessions to prevent a problem going outside?
- 7/12. Have you ever been able to come to a "gentlemen's agreement" to solve certain problems? (Examples.)

Duties, Power, and Function.

- 8/1. Do you feel that union officers should have more loyalty to the union or to the company?
- 8/2. As a supervisor, what do you regard as your main task?
- 8/3. Do you feel that you have enough power to do your job?
- 8/4. Do you feel that you could do a better job if some things were changed?

- 8/6. What do you regard as the main task of the union officers?
- 8/7. Do you think that they have enough power to do their job?
- 8/8. How do you feel, in general, about the union-management relations in this plant?
- 8/9. Do you feel that the union officers perform any useful function for the company?

SCHEDULE B-2

Interview Schedule for Union Officers

Since the questionnaires for management and union contained many identical items, only those which differ from B-1 are reproduced here. All the questions used in B-1 were also used in B-2 with the transposition of "union officer" and "supervisor" as required.

Area of Jurisdiction, Industrial History, Union Affiliation, and Ethnic Factors.

- 1/1. Which union do you represent?
- 1/8. What union office(s) do you presently hold?
- 1/9. How long have you held this union office?
- 1/10. When did you last come up for election?
- 1/11. Were you opposed in the last election?
- 1/12. When do you next come up for election?
- 1/13. Do you intend to run for re-election?
- 1/14. Why?
- 1/15. Which other union posts have you held in the past?
- 1/16. Have you ever held a supervisory job with the company?

Cross-report on relationship partner.

- 3/7. Has this supervisor ever been a member of your union?

The Incidence and Nature of Grievances.

- 5/1. On the average, what would be the total number of items that your members would raise as potential grievances in a month?
- 5/2. What percentage of these would you normally reject? Why?
- 5/3. What percentage of the grievances that you take up do you normally manage to settle on the shop floor with the particular foreman involved?
- 5/4. What kinds of things can you normally settle at this level?
- 5/5. What kinds of things can you normally not settle at this level?

Retaining Grievances at the local level.

- 7/1. How would you describe your relationship with the works manager?
- 7/2. Do you think that he knows the contract agreement well?
- 7/5. What percentage of grievances would you be able to settle at this level?
- 7/6. What kinds of things do you find easiest to settle with him?
- 7/7. What kinds of things do you find most difficult to settle? Why?
- 7/8. Do you find that he is prepared to make concessions on some things to stop them going higher up? Which things?
- 7/9. Are there any issues upon which he will not make concessions?

Duties, Power, and Function.

- 8/5. What services do you provide for your members apart from contract matters?

SCHEDULE B-3

Interview Schedule for both Supervisors and Union Officers

Contextual Factors.

1. What is the physical distance between the normal location of the foreman and the union officer in the plant?
2. Is the foreman's office open or closed? Are there any physical barriers to interaction?
3. Are there any organizational barriers to the initiation of a meeting between the parties to the relationship?
4. What is the present condition and future prospect for the craft? Is it an expanding or contracting trade?
5. What is the skill distribution of the workforce in the shop?
6. What is the estimated number of employees in the shop?
7. What is the ethnic composition of the workforce in the shop?

Trade Unions Represented by the Respondents

1. The International Association of Machinists.
2. United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry of the United States and Canada.
3. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers.
4. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
5. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
6. Sheet Metal Workers International Association.
7. International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, Power Plant Operators, Helpers, Round House and Railway Shop Labourers.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Arensberg, Conrad M., et al. Research in Industrial Human Relations. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.
- Argyris, Chris. Executive Leadership: An Appraisal of a Manager in Action. New York: Harper & Bros., 1953.
- _____. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.
- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945.
- _____. Organization and Management: Selected Papers. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Blum, Fred H. Toward a Democratic Work Process. New York: Harper & Bros., 1953.
- Clegg, H. A., Killick, A. J., and Adams, Rex. Trade Union Officers. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Derber, Milton, Chalmers, W. Ellison, and Stagner, Ross. The Local Union-Management Relationship. Urbana: University of Illinois, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1960.
- Drucker, Peter F. The Concept of the Corporation. New York: The John Day Co., 1946.
- Dubin, Robert. Human Relations in Administration: The Sociology of Organization. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.
- Fleishman, Edwin A., Harris, Edwin F., and Burt, Harold E. Leadership and Supervision in Industry. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1955.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.
- Harbison, Frederick H., and Coleman, John R. Goals and Strategy in Collective Bargaining. New York: Harper & Bros., 1951.

- Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1950.
- Hoslett, S. D. Human Factors in Management. New York: Harper & Bros., 1946.
- Kornhauser, Arthur, Dubin, Robert, and Ross, Arthur M. Industrial Conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1954.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, Trow, Martin, and Coleman, James. Union Democracy. (Anchor Books.) New York: Doubleday & Co., 1962.
- Mason, Edward S. The Corporation in Modern Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.
- Moore, Wilbert E. Industrial Relations and the Social Order. 2nd ed. revised. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951.
- _____. The Conduct of the Corporation. New York: Random House, 1962.
- Paterson, T. T. Glasgow, Limited: A Case Study. (University of Glasgow, Social and Economic Studies, No. 7). New York: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Sayles, Leonard R., and Strauss, George. The Local Union: Its Place in the Industrial Plant. New York: Harper & Bros., 1953.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S., and Kahn, Robert L. Participation in Local Unions. New York: Row, Peterson, & Co., 1958.
- Whyte, William Foote. Man and Organization: Three Problems in Human Relations in Industry. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1959.
- _____. Men At Work. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1961.

Articles and Periodicals

- Dalton, Melville. "Unofficial Union-Management Relations," American Sociological Review, XV (October, 1950), 611-619.

- Simon, Herbert A. "Decision-Making and Administrative Organization," Public Administration Review, (1944), 16-30.
- Stinchcombe, Arthur L. "Bureaucratic and Craft Administration of Production: A Comparative Study," Administrative Science Quarterly, (1959), 168-187.
- Tannenbaum, Robert and Massarik, Fred. "Participation by Subordinates in the Managerial Decision-Making Process," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, (1950), 408-418.

Reports

- National Planning Association. Fundamentals of Labor Peace, A Final Report. (Case Study No. 14). Washington, 1953.
- Viteles, Morris S., and Thompson, Claude E. The Role of Leadership in Supervisory Management. (Proceedings of a Public Forum sponsored by The Economic and Business Foundation). New Wilmington, Pennsylvania, December 1945.

Unpublished Material

- International Railway Unions Research Bureau, Montreal.
 "Submission Before a Board of Conciliation and Investigation on behalf of the Associated Railway Unions." Montreal, 1960. (Mimeographed.)